

J M Alister

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

Evangelical Repository.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN THE FOR-
MULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND OF THE
CHURCHES IN HOLLAND.

VOL. VIII.

OCTOBER, 1831.

NO. 5.

CONTENTS.

	page.		page.
ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.		History of the New Testament,.....	295
On the Divinity of Christ—Dissertation III,		History of a Revival,.....	300
Part 3,.....	257	Fencing in Heresy,.....	314
On things Indifferent—A dent Spirits, &c	265	Blackstone on Duelling and Suicide,.....	317
A maxim of Bible Religion,.....	179	A Visit to the Pope's Private Chapel,.....	318
Life of Francis Turretine,.....	289	Ecclesiastical Record,.....	320

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way,
and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls.
JER VI. 16.

EDITED BY A MINISTER OF THE ASSOCIATE CHURCH.

ALBANY:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY E. D. PACKARD & CO. NO. 71 STATE-STREET.
Two sheets—octavo.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
 AND
Evangelical Repository.

VOL. VIII.

OCTOBER, 1831.

NO. 6.

[For the Religious Monitor.]
 ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.
 DISSERTATION III.

PART III.—REFLECTIONS.

The truth of the doctrine proved from Titus ii. 13.—“ Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”

From this great subject we may make the following observations:

1st. We may see the gross error of those who deny the divinity of Christ. His Deity appears conspicuous in all the parts of our salvation. Who but a God could *purchase*, and who but a God could *give* the great salvation? This he claims as his prerogative. “I, even I, am the Lord: and besides me there is no Saviour,” Isa. 43, 11.

That he was a man is plain enough; this was necessary that he might “put away our sins by the sacrifice of himself.” But, his Deity was proved by doing this. It was because he was “the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express character of his substance” that he was capable to “purge our sins.” He made the purification.

It is indeed very wonderful that he who was born, who fed, who slept, who grieved and died, should be God; and that the nature that did these things was united to a nature that did none of them. That though he appeared in the “fulness of time, his goings forth were from everlasting,” that a child born was “the mighty God,” and a “son given, the everlasting Father,” that he who “only hath immortality” and “abideth forever” should be obedient to death, even the death of the cross.—Yet even then, visible testimonies were given to the divinity of his person. “For at his crucifixion when there was none to sing the Hosannahs, “the graves were opened,” that the dead might rise, because the living were silent; “the

rocks were rent,” when human souls had no feeling, the vail of the temple was torn in twain;” when the worshippers about it were at ease in Zion: and these poured arguments upon the Centurian to make him cry out, “Verily this was the son of God!” As if when his Deity was dropt by the sons of men, it should be confessed in the pangs and groans of nature.”*

2nd. Though the divinity of Christ was so clearly proved both from the Scriptures, and by the miracles of Christ himself, yet the denying of it, was the first error that was broached in the christian church, by Simon Magus, Ebion and Cerinthus against whom John wrote his gospel. It was opposed by Paulus Samosetanus Bishop of Antioch, who arose in the year 272. At last all the different opinions were gathered into one head by Arius, in the beginning of the fourth century. He allowed Christ to have a divine nature, but that it was derived, and dependant. But, though his doctrines were condemned by the council of Nice in the year 325, yet they were spread over the church during the space of 300 years, and the faithful witnesses were persecuted with the greatest cruelty, by the Goths and Vandals, the most barbarous people then on the earth.

During the space of 600 years, we have little account of these heresies, Satan, as D. Owen observes, being then employed in raising Antichrist, to the height of his temporal and spiritual power. But, to prevent the spreading of the pure doctrines of the gospel, he raised up some, who had been active in promoting the reformation from Popery, to revive the old heresies. Great opposition was made to the doctrine of the Trinity, and in particular to the supreme Deity of the Son of God. Servetus is generally considered as the first of this wretched num-

* Bradbury.

ber. He stuffed all his discourses with horrid blasphemies. Beza tells us that he called the Trinity "*Tricipitem Cerberum*," "the three head Cerberus" or monster, and wrote that Moses was "a ridiculous Impostor."—His filthy abominations concerning the generation of the Son, some know, and others need not. There are passages in his books, that I forbear to transcribe or translate.

It would swell this branch of the subject beyond proper bounds, to mention all the distinguished characters, and the visible judgments of God, upon some of them. We shall only mention Laelius Socinus the uncle, and Faustus Socinus the nephew. They affirmed that Jesus Christ was a mere man, and thus razed the whole gospel. From them the whole herd afterwards, took the denomination of *Socinians*, from whom issue the whole Unitarian *Spawn*. Laelius Socinus, who laid the foundation that his nephew built upon, died in Switzerland, then of the age of 37. He was, as the author of the life of Faustus Socinus relates, in a readiness to have published his *notions* and *conceptions*, when God, by a merciful providence, to prevent a little the pouring out of the poison by so skilful a hand, took him off by sudden death. Faustus Socinus having got his uncles papers, promoted, and succeeded, in the same cause, by the following means: He joined himself to nine of their societies, because being divided among themselves, he knew, that by adhering to one professedly, he should engage all the rest against him. His pretence was, their rigid injunction to be re-baptized, and therefore he affirmed that Baptism was only instituted for the initiation of them, who from any other false religion, were returned to the religion of Christ. Thus, he was less exposed to the fury of the Papists. And indeed his privacy of living was a great means of his security. He was a scholar, and was able to defend them against their opposers, the most of them being miserably weak, and unlearned. He owned all those as of his party, who upon any pretence denied the doctrine of the Trinity, and forsook the reformed church. Unto all these and the like advantages, he added all the *arts* and *subtilities*, all the *diligence* and *industry*, that were any way tending to his end. And in the course of 24 years, he got all his opinions enthroned, and his practice taken almost for a rule.* "Socinus made it his design to gather the scattered Anti-trinitarians

into a body." "At first there were almost as many minds as men among them: the essence of their agreement, being purely opposition to the Trinity, upon what principle soever. Had a man learned to blaspheme the holy Trinity, were it on Photinian, Arian, Sabellian, Mahometan or Judaical principles, he was a companion and brother among them.* Thus as these persons were divided in their opinions, they could be no less in their practice. The Arians spake of Christ with more respect than some others. The Samosetianians would not baptize in his name. Socinians, though they conceived of him in the same manner, i. e. as a mere man, nevertheless declared that he should be worshipped. "The Arians did not give divine worship to Christ. It is better to be a Trinitarian, than not give worship to Christ, yea a Trinitarian, in my opinion, suppose he lives in obedience to the precepts of Christ, is justly called a christian. But he that does not worship Christ with divine regard, can by no means be named a christian. Therefore no doubt of it, the Homoeousians i. e. the assertors of the equality between the Father and the Son, were less displeasing to God than the rabble of Arians."†

Saith Dr. Owen, "I thought to have insisted in particular, on their particular ways of insinuating their abominations, of the baits they lay, the devices they have, their high pretences to reason, and holiness in their lives, or honesty: as also, to have evinced by undeniable evidence, that there are thousands in the Papacy and among the reformed churches, that are wholly baptized into their vile opinions and infidelity, though for the love of their temporal enjoyments, which are better to them than their religion, they profess it not."‡

Bradbury, having quoted this passage, observes, "It is a pity he has not done it, that we may see what a unity of spirit has possessed the party, that the same rudeness, deceit and impiety has been of old, that is revived in our day. Never did people pretend to sincerity, moderation and peace, with more *noise*, and less *reason*. What hypocrisy has it brought into the established church, men joining in prayers, and taking their part in doxologies, which they do not believe? Now, if "what is not of faith, is sin," they have chosen the curse of the wicked, that "their prayers become sin." Reconciling the new scheme, to the Athanasian creed, is only reconciling it to five hun-

* Dr. Owen's Vind. Evan. Prof. 36. 42.

* Dr. Owen's Vind. Evan. Prof. 21.

† Socin. Ep. and Weich. 45. 2.

‡ Dr. Owen's Vind. Evan. Prof. p. 63.

dred a year; and taking wages to *maintain* what they take pains to *destroy*." Thus, our modern Unitarians have nothing *new* in their cause. They only revive the old, rotten, exploded Heresies: and they have nothing new, in the *manner* of promoting them, they only *practice* the old *cunning prevarications*. They may indeed plead antiquity for their opinions, for they are as ancient, not only as Socinus, Servetus, Samosetanus, but as Cerinthus, Judaizing Ebion, and Simon Magus. But antiquity is no proof of orthodoxy; for Satan was "a murderer from the beginning, abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it," John, 8, 44. And we read of a Church, which, without doubt, had a divine original, that she was old in adulteries," Ezek. 34, 43. And there is nothing *new* in our cause, for saith John, "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." Chap. i. 1, 2. And Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

"Let us not deceive ourselves; Satan is a busy enemy: he hovers up and down, in the vain imaginations of a confused multitude, whose tongues are divided, that they understand not one another. I dare say, that if ever he settle in a stated opposition to the gospel, it will be in Socinianism.*"

3rd. We may see the happy influence of this great subject in the duties of religion. These are doctrines according to Godliness; they give us the best arguments for it, and sufficient assistance in it. The adversaries affirm, that a man may be saved, though he believe not the doctrine of the Trinity, the satisfaction of Christ, &c., if he lives holily; that it is *madness*, and *folly* to break love, and communion about such differences. Nay, some are so *bold*, or rather *blasphemous*, as to say, "that if persons keep to their duty, they shall not be damned for not believing contradictions." "What God will damn men for is not so much our enquiry; but this we are sure of, that "it is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." "The ransomed of the Lord admire this doctrine. It is as inconsistent to *their* reason, as it is to others. They do not make it appear in any other light than that of scripture. They see it possesses a chief room in their religion: and whatever articles of faith an unconverted

soul may think sufficient, yet they that have tasted the grace of God, begin with this, viz. the Trinity as "the pillar and ground of truth."* But let us try whether a man can perform his duty, without these doctrines of the gospel.

1st. Let us attend to the duty of prayer. The commands for it, the promises made to it, and the advantages received by it are innumerable. But if you deny the doctrine of the Trinity, the divinity, and satisfaction of Christ, the divinity and influence of the spirit; how can we pray to God, and be accepted? We cannot approach to an absolute God. "In his sight no living man can be justified." Psalms, 143, 2. And if Jesus Christ be not Jehovah our righteousness, we have no mediator in whose name, we may plead, and by whose merits we may succeed. If the Spirit be not God, we have no person to "help our infirmities," when "we know not what to pray for as we ought." And according to another *notion*, if the Father and the Spirit be *excluded* from *all* agency in our redemption, we cannot pray to the former, nor look for assistance from the latter. So that, here, are inseparable bars thrown in our way of approaching to God in the duty of prayer.

But, as the doctrine of the Trinity is the first, and fundamental article of divine revelation, and prayer is the first and fundamental duty in practical religion, so the latter has an immediate respect to the former, as the Apostle declares, "Through him," i. e. Jesus Christ, "we both, i. e. Jews and Gentiles, have an access by one spirit unto the Father," Eph. 2, 18. "We have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus," Heb. 10, 19. It is from the cross, and the sacrifice upon it, the believer fills his mouth with arguments. Saith the Apostle, "God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father." Gal. 5, 6, 12. He enables us to cry as the same Apostle expresseth it in another place, "ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father." Rom. 8, 17.

2d. Let us bring these doctrines to the ordinance of baptism. If the Son and the Holy Ghost are not God, why are their names put upon us equally, with the Father in baptism? Are we baptized into the name of one supreme, and two subordinate Gods? No; for to show that though the persons be distinct, the nature is one, we are baptized not into *names*, as if there were

* Dr. Owen's Vind. Evan. Prof. 69.

* Bradbury.

Lords many, and Gods many, but into the name of God, thus plainly declaring that there is no more than *one*. As saith the prophet, "the Lord shall be King over all the earth, in that day, there shall be one Lord, and his name one." Zech. iv. 3.

If the son were dependent, derived, according to the Arians, or a mere man, according to the Socinians, would he have commissioned his disciples to baptize in his name equally, with that of the Father?—And would it not shock a christian parent to be told, that his child was baptized in the name of an *Instrument*? But when Christ commanded to baptize in his *own* name, "he thought it no robbery to be equal with God." "Or otherwise I am sure, it is out of my power to defend our cause against a Jew, supposing he should plead in this manner. "By what authority are you baptized but that of Jesus? Yourself own him to be a creature, an inferior dependent being.—Whereas our circumcision was ordered by the most high God: and why shall one that is not *God*, bring in a solemnity of his own, to juggle out the ordinance of him that is?—Why must a God by office supercede the appointment of him who is a God by nature?" "Our Lord acts in the form of God," "when he gives rules to his own house."* The name of the Holy Ghost could not be put upon us if he was not our creator. Elihu says, "the Spirit of the Lord hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty has given me life." He also applies the great salvation, quicken, purifies, comforts and seals believers to the day of redemption.

3d Let us try how these doctrines of the enemies of the truth will suit a believer, when he sits down at the Lord's table. If the Son and the Spirit be not equal with the Father, we cannot have fellowship with them, equally with him. And what benefit could a believer receive by discerning the body and blood of an *Agent* or *Instrument*? But, the Apostle John saith, "truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" 1 Ep. 1. 3 And saith Paul, "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all, Amen. 1 Cor. 13, 14. At the Lord's table, the believer hath communion with the *Father*, in his sovereign, free, and *expensive* love, in not "sparing his own Son, but delivering him up for us all." With the *Son* himself, in the whole compass of his character, as the one mediator between God and man, partic-

ularly in his sufferings, as "he was made a curse for us." He hath all the blessings purchased by Christ's death, sealed to him, in the sacrament of the Lord's supper,—and himself "sealed to the day of redemption."

He hath also communion with the *Holy Ghost*, by receiving his gifts, and graces—he gets knowledge to discern the Lord's body, faith to feed upon him, is brought to repentance, love, new obedience, and qualified to walk in the Spirit, with humility, reverence, and godly fear. Thus we may see the folly of talking about keeping by duty, without believing and improving the doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity and satisfaction of the Son, and the Deity and influence of the Holy Ghost. These are not speculative opinions, they are the foundation of the whole gospel, and of all practical religion. No spiritual blessings can be received, and no branch of godliness can be properly performed, without a knowledge, and improvement of them by the power of the Holy Ghost. Though we ought to "contend for the faith once delivered to the saints," it is of no advantage to ourselves, to have the best of the argument, if we do not make a particular improvement of these truths, to our own souls. What are we the better, if we can prove that Christ is God, if we have no *sense* or *sweetness* in our hearts, that he is a God in covenant with us? Or prove that "he died the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God," if *our* sins be not imputed to him, and his righteousness imputed us? Or prove, that the Spirit works the conversion of sinners, comforts, and establishes believers, by Almighty, and irrestable grace, if we are not experimentally acquainted with the exceeding greatness of the power of God, in quickening, enlightening, sanctifying, comforting, and sealing us to the day of redemption? Saith Dr. Owen, "Let us not think we are any thing the better, for our conviction of the *truth* of the great doctrines of the gospel, for which we contend with these men, unless we find the *power* of the truths *abiding* in our own hearts, and have a continual experience of their *necessity*, and *excellency* in our standing before God, and our communion with him."

We shall conclude this dissertation, in the words, with which the Apostle Jude concludes his epistle, "But, ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus unto eternal life." "Now unto him that is able to keep you from fall-

* Bradbury's Sermons on Baptism, 54.

ling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory, with exceeding joy.—To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, Amen.”—**QUIS LIBET.**

[For the Religious Monitor.]

ON THINGS INDIFFERENT—ARDENT SPIRITS, &c.

While the scriptures recognize a certain *liberty*, as belonging to the christian, they, at the same time, caution him against such a use of it, as might prove detrimental, either to himself or others. “Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty, only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh.” “Take heed lest this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak.” When God commands, we have certainly no *liberty* to disobey. But where he leaves matters *indifferent*, that is, gives no express injunction or prohibition concerning them, we are allowed to act according to our own pleasure. And acting according to our own pleasure in relation to such matters constitutes what is usually termed “christian” or “gospel liberty.” But even here, we are “not without law to God, but under law to Christ.” For there are certain general principles, according to which this liberty is to be regulated. One of which is, that it is never to be used to the *offence* of others. This principle is of the utmost importance, in ascertaining what is our duty in many particular cases. And by this principle alone, we apprehend, the subject, which, at present, very justly, engrosses much of the public attention, is to be determined. We refer to the use of **ARDENT SPIRITS.** Now to ascertain what is duty in relation to this subject is the object of the present communication. Our remarks, however, shall be somewhat general, so as to apply to all matters of indifference.

The best of causes may be prejudiced by bad arguments. And it must be confessed, that the cause of Temperance has greatly suffered in this way. Much has been spoken and written upon the subject, at war with the pure principles of the word of God. Tract after tract, volume after volume have been poured in upon society, from which, in consequence of the untenable grounds taken, the man who wishes to be guided by scriptural truth, has turned away in disgust. On this, as on all other subjects connected with christian doctrine and duty, we would say, “to the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is be-

cause there is no light in them, let us then search the scriptures, that we may discover the mind and will of God in relation to the use of spiritous liquors.

During the Old Testament dispensation, we find, that a distinction between *meats* and *drinks* was, by divine appointment, observed. This distinction, however, was not moral, but ceremonial in its nature. And by the death of Christ, who was the end of that law, it was abolished. The abolition of this distinction is plainly affirmed by the Apostle in the fourteenth chapter of his epistle to the Romans. There he says, “let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not, and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, for God has received him.” And again, “I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself.” In his epistle to the Corinthians, in answer to their inquiries respecting things offered to idols, he assures them that even these things were in their nature indifferent, and might, under certain limitations, which he specifies, be lawfully eaten. Thus, 1 Cor. viii. 8. “meat commendeth us not to God: for neither if we eat, are we the better; neither if we eat not, are we the worse.” Thus also, chap. x. 25. “whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no questions for conscience’ sake.” And v. 27. “if any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before you eat, asking no questions for conscience’ sake” Corresponding to this the Apostle informs Timothy, 1st Epistle, iv. 4. that, “every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.” And this declaration he makes immediately after having given it as a mark of those, (referring to the apostate church of Rome) who, in the latter times should depart from the faith, that they would “command to abstain from meats which God had created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth.” It follows, then, that, under the gospel dispensation, all kinds of meats and all kinds of drinks are in themselves indifferent, and in respect to which christian liberty may be exercised. And it is in vain to attempt to separate ardent spirits from things of this denomination. For even during the ceremonial dispensation, when the liberty of the believer was greatly abridged, it was lawful to use wine and strong drink, except in the case of those persons who had assumed the vow of Nazaritism, or had been

laid under it by a positive revelation from God. "When either man or woman shall separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazarite, to separate themselves unto the Lord, he shall separate himself from wine, and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes, or dried." Num. 6. 2. 3. Now the Nazarites being prohibited the use of wine and strong drink, during the time of their separation, *by a special law*, implied that others had full permission to use them. That wine and strong drink might be lawfully used under that dispensation is further evident from Deut. 14. 25, 26. "Then shalt thou turn it (the tithe) into money, and bind up the money in thine hand, and shalt go unto the place which the Lord thy God shall choose: And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth." &c. If, then, the christian's liberty has not been abridged, but enlarged, by the introduction of the gospel dispensation, it must be evident, that *ardent spirits* are to be classed among the things indifferent; or, in other words, may be lawfully used, provided certain limitations, specified in the word of God, be duly observed.

Accordingly we are led to remark, that our liberty in relation to the use of "things indifferent" is always to be subject to the following regulations.

1. A full persuasion of mind that we possess this liberty. A person's liberty may be greatly curtailed, by his own ignorance, and the doubtings of his own mind. For, in regard to any indifferent action, unless we are satisfied that we have full liberty to perform it, it ceases to be indifferent to us, and the performance of it would be sinful.—"There is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean." Hence one man may do that which it would be unlawful for another to do, owing to his doubts respecting its lawfulness. So the Apostle teaches, Rom. xiv. 2, 5. "One believeth that he may eat all things, another, who is weak, eateth herbs." "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." In all such cases every man must act according to the light which he has, or according to the persuasion of his own mind. Indeed to act contrary to such persuasion in any instance would be sinful, would be an act of self condemnation. Hence that chap-

ter is closed with these words:—"Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." That is, we are condemned by our own consciences, if we eat—if we perform any act which is in itself indifferent—when doubts exist in our minds in regard to the propriety of so doing, and when we do not possess the belief or persuasion that doing so is agreeable to the will of God. This sentiment is further confirmed by the Apostle, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 7. "As concerning, therefore, the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice to idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one." "Howbeit, there is not in every man that knowledge; for some, with conscience of the idol to this hour, eat it as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled." The Apostle means those, who could not wholly divest their minds of all reverential regard for the idol, as though something sacred and divine belonged to it. Therefore, their eating was unlawful—it defiled their conscience. But the case was different with others, who were firmly persuaded in their minds that "an idol was nothing in the world." In respect to such the Apostle adds, "neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not are we the worse."

2. Moderation is another principle which should govern the use of "things indifferent." We refer here particularly to those things which have a respect to the *appetites* of our nature. The immoderate or intemperate use of any of the good creatures of God, is sinful. That which is lawful in itself may be rendered unlawful through the want of moderation. The scriptures abound with instruction on this point. The three terms, *moderation, temperance and sobriety*, which we there meet with, all relate to the measure according to which, things of the above description, are to be used. "Let your *moderation* be known to all men." "He that striveth for the mastery is *temperate* in all things." "Add to your faith, virtue; and to your virtue knowledge; and to knowledge, *temperance*." "Be *sober*, be vigilant, for your adversary the Devil goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour." The grace of God, teacheth us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live *sobriety*. God gives us permission to use the world, but not to abuse it. The abuse

of those things which Providence furnishes for the support and comfort of our bodies, or in other words, *intemperance*, whether in eating or drinking is a most grievous sin, against which the terrible woe of the Almighty God is repeatedly denounced. The admonition of our blessed Lord to his disciples is worthy of the most exact remembrance. "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness."

3. In exercising our liberty in regard to "things indifferent," the glory of God is to be kept in view. It is a plain maxim, that whatever God, of his bountifulness, bestows upon us, should be used by us for the promotion of his glory. Indeed his glory should be the chief end of all our actions. We are commanded to "glorify him in our bodies and spirits which are his." In using the bounties of Providence, we glorify God, only, when we acknowledge him as the giver, receive them with grateful hearts, refrain from the least abuse of them, and by means of them devote ourselves more vigorously to whatever service he requires us to perform. As it respects the use of "ardent spirits," none can be so blind as not to see, that intemperance is most disglorifying to God. For surely, whatever degrades the man, dishonors the God that made him.—But even where there is no intemperance in the case, other circumstances may render the use of "ardent spirits" entirely derogatory to the glory of God. It is not merely as a caution against the intemperate use of meats and drinks, but also against such a use of them as might, in any degree, prove ensnaring to the consciences of others, that the Apostle, when speaking of things offered to idols, draws the conclusion "whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. x. 31. The connection, in which this text is found, shows, that while the rule it embraces extends to all things whatsoever, it has a more special reference to "things indifferent," and of these "meats and drinks," in particular.

4. There is, also, another principle, by which, our liberty in regard to "things indifferent," is to be regulated; viz. it is never to be used to the *offence* of others. It is by this principle, as has been before intimated, that the final determination relative to the use of "spirituous liquors" is to be made. Hence it is requisite that on this point we be somewhat particular. We have given to this subject a long and patient, and we trust, prayerful investigation; and what is

here offered, we are persuaded, is in accordance with the revealed will of God. Let not the reader, then, suppose, because he feels persuaded that the use of ardent spirits is in itself lawful, and because he is temperate in the use of them, and because he is not conscious of overlooking the glory of God in the matter, that therefore he is innocent, and may lawfully continue in the use of them; without also taking into consideration the principle, which we have now stated, and which is clearly exhibited in a text before cited, "take heed, lest by any means, this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to them that are weak."

A *stumblingblock*, in a spiritual sense, is that, which is the cause or occasion of a person's falling into sin. The word *offence* is often used in the same sense, though sometimes it signifies the excitation of *prejudice* and of *grief* in the mind. To cause a person to *offend* is to throw a stumblingblock in his way, by means of which he stumbles from the path of duty and falls into sin. Now let it be observed, that every thing is not to be avoided which may prove a stumblingblock to others. The preaching of the cross has, we are assured, this effect, in many instances; yet to refrain from preaching, on that account, would be sinful in the extreme. Because, it is made the duty of ministers to preach Christ, though all men should be offended in him. Paul speaks of the *offence of the cross*—he assures us, that "the preaching of Christ crucified" was a *stumblingblock* to the Jews and *foolishness* to the Greeks; yet on that account he ceased not to fulfil his determination "to know nothing among them, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." Indeed, whatever is enjoined in the way of *duty* must be performed, regardless of consequences. But the case is entirely different in respect to those things, which are matters of *forbearance*, or *indifference*; where *doing* or *not doing* is left optional. Here the course of conduct, which is known to give *offence*, must be relinquished, else we sin not only against the *brother* who is offended, but also against *Christ himself*. It is in vain to say, that "according to this principle, we must abstain from the use of food altogether, if our eating should happen to prove *offensive* to some weak and ignorant brother;" because, the laws of God makes it our *duty* to eat food for the sustenance of life. We must not *kill*. We must use all lawful means for the preservation of our lives. The *eating* or *not eating* of food is not left to our choice as a matter of *indiffer-*

ence, which may be done or not. We have the *liberty* indeed to choose between *food* and *food*, but not to abstain from *every kind* of food. If the use, however, of some particular kind of food, gives *offence*, we must abstain from *it*, and betake ourselves to others, which fall within the range of our liberty. It is not contended, therefore, that we must ever refrain from the performance of *duty*, on the ground of giving offence, but only from those things which are not made *dutiful* by the law of God, but are left as *things indifferent*.

Now that we *may* abstain from the use of things indifferent can scarcely be denied.—The Rechabites, in obedience to their father's command, abstained from the use of wine, and their obedience is commended by God himself. John, the Baptist, was a man of abstinence—"he came neither eating bread nor drinking wine"—and who can say that his abstinence was any breach of moral obligation? As to meats, drinks, clothing, or any other matter of indifference, abstinence on our part, from what others may deem fashionable and proper, can never be censured as sinful, unless such abstinence should really prove *offensive*. It follows, then, that abstinence may be practised.—"Neither if we eat, are we the better; neither if we eat not, are we the worse."

But abstinence not only *may*, but *should* be practiced, whenever the opposite course is found to give *offence*, or cast a stumblingblock in the way of others. Let this point be duly considered. Rom. xiv. 20 "All things indeed are pure; but [notwithstanding this admission] it is evil for that man who eateth with OFFENCE." We have classed ardent spirits among the "things indifferent." Applied to the use of *them*, the language of this text would run—"All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who *drinketh* with offence;" that is, who by his drinking draws others into sin, or furnishes them with an occasion of sinning. Hence, the Apostle concludes in the next verse; "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing, whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." This text of itself is sufficient to settle the matter. But we find the Apostle reasoning to the same purpose in his first epistle to the church of Corinth: "Take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak. For if any man see thee, which hast knowledge, sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things

which are offered to idols; and through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died? But when ye SIN so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye SIN against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to OFFEND, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to OFFEND." 1 Cor. viii. 9, 13. What a noble resolution! This holy man would part with his liberty, rather than, by using it, give offence to a brother, or in any way be the occasion of his sinning, defiling his conscience, and consequently destroying his peace and comfort of mind. In this, Paul exhibits himself to us as an example, which it is becoming in us to follow.—"I beseech you," says he "be ye followers of me" But, if we look forward to the tenth chapter we shall find the Apostle still pursuing the same argument. Verse 23, "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not." Here he intimates, that things, lawful in themselves, should be avoided on the ground of expediency, or as he explains himself, on the ground of their not conducing to edification; which indeed is always the case whenever offence is given. Again, v. 27, "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you eat, asking no questions for conscience sake." Here the christian's liberty is asserted; but observe what follows—"But, if any man say unto you, this is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake—conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?" In these words the Apostle speaks decisively.—"Eat not for his sake that showed it"—because, in that case, you would encourage him to persist in his idolatry. For *you*, that are a christian, after having been told by this heathen that the meat before you has been consecrated to his idol; for you to eat of it, would be, in effect, to tell him, that his idol was a real divinity, and that it was right to offer sacrifice to it.—"Eat not for conscience sake, not thine own, but of the other,"—The believer himself could eat with a clear conscience, "knowing that an idol is nothing in the world;" but he must also pay some respect to the conscience of the other, and not do that, which would have a tendency to involve it deeper in guilt, and harden it more and more in a course of idolatrous worship. And in confirmation of this view of christian conduct, the Apostle very appositely asks—"Why is my liberty judg-

ed of another man's conscience?"—why should I, by an imprudent and unseasonable use of my christian liberty, expose myself to the uncharitable judgment of another man's conscience, who might indeed, with apparent good reason, pronounce me to be a *time server*, a christian only in *name*, yea, a person as ready (when it served a turn) to render religious honor to an idol, as to the Lord Jesus Christ? After reasoning in the above manner, the Apostle concludes with this exhortation—(v. 32.) "give none offence, neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God.—Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved."

On the whole, then, the conclusion is inevitable, that if the use of "ardent spirits" causes *offence*, it ought to be totally abstained from. And now it only remains to be shown, that the use of them *does give offence*, or occasions the stumbling and fall of others. Perhaps an attempt to show this would be an insult offered to the intelligence of our readers. It is well known that our country is literally swarming with drunkards—that intemperance, with shameless front, stalks forth through the length and breadth of the whole land, having in its cursed train, poverty, wretchedness, disease and death! Yes, ETERNAL DEATH! And is it not equally as well known that this alarming evil is encouraged and promoted by every person who uses the drunkard's *drink*? He may not, indeed, ever intoxicate himself; but, no matter—he throws the influence of his example into the scale of intemperance; and in this respect he is "a partaker of other men's sins." Nay, though he should not drink himself, yet if he hold the bottle to his neighbor's mouth, and thus encourage drunkenness in him, he is guilty, he is an accessary in crime; "wo unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth the bottle to him and maketh him drunken." Hab. ii. 15. This woe is not incurred exclusively by him who *deals* in the intoxicating article, or by him who *treats* his neighbor to the inebriating draught; it is incurred also, in a greater or less degree, by every one, who, with his eyes open upon the desolating evils of intemperance, helps forward those evils by the influence of his *example*. And who can doubt, that *example* in this matter exerts a baleful influence over others? Is not this known to be the case in families? in the church? in civil society? And the example is the more dangerous in proportion as it is set by persons of character and stand-

ing in society. What, for instance, can be a greater inducement to a person to gratify his lust of intemperance, than to behold the professor of religion, a man of knowledge and high pretensions to purity of morals, frequenting *taverns and grog shops*, and sitting with the cup of intoxication in his hand? Does not this conduct embolden others to proceed to the *immoderate* use of that which the professor considers himself as using with *moderation*? The words of the Apostle apply to this equally as to that which he had immediately in view—"if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him that is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols?" We conclude, then, that no man, under existing circumstances, when the use of ardent spirits is producing the most desolating effects, both temporally and spiritually considered, throughout the land, can himself engage even in the *temperate* use of them, without giving *offence* to others, or casting such a stumblingblock in their way, as may prove the means of their temporal and eternal ruin. Hence, for the reasons before advanced, *total abstinence* is rendered a duty.

But, it may be said, we are only forbid to offend a *brother*, and, that as church members, we have no concern with "those that are without." If it were only true, that there were no intemperate members of the church, and no danger of others becoming so, the objection would be more plausible; but this is lamentably not the case; therefore, even so far as the *brethren* are concerned, abstinence should be practiced. But it is not true that we are *only* forbid to offend our brother. We are to "do good to all men." We are to "love our neighbor as ourselves." It is our duty to promote so far as possible, the temporal and spiritual interests of all, whether believers or unbelievers. We are not to throw a stumbling block in the way of any, even our worst enemies. The Apostle intimates, as we have already seen, that the *christian guest* ought not to eat the meat offered to an idol, for the sake of his *heathen host*—for the sake of *his* conscience. Indeed, he distinguishes between the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles and the Church of God, and declares that offence is to be given to neither. "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God."

But our Saviour did not abstain from the use of wine, although by it many have been intoxicated in all ages! We answer that

intemperance was very far from being a prevailing vice among the Jews at that time. And besides, the great body of that nation belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, who made their virtue and morality the ground of their justification before God. Their religion consisted much in *abstinence*; they "fasted twice in the week;" things of this kind constituted their righteousness on which they reposed their hopes of eternal life. But our Saviour would encourage none to rest upon a mere external morality; he would engage in none of their abstinences, which were not commanded by the law of God, lest his conduct should be thought to countenance the prevailing error of the times; he would teach men the important lesson—"Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."

There is indeed, but one thing, that we know of, which would render abstinence, in the case under consideration, sinful; viz:—*the enjoining it as a matter essential to salvation*. Judaizing teachers, in the days of the Apostles, contended, that, in addition to faith in Christ, obedience to the law of Moses was necessary in order to justification. And when Peter, by his dissembling course, was found to countenance them in this error, Paul "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." When Peter first came to Antioch he did not hesitate to eat with the Gentiles; this indeed was contrary to Jewish custom, but it was in itself a matter of indifference; however, he afterwards abstained from this, through fear of certain Judaizers that had come down from Jerusalem. Now, though this abstaining from eating with the Gentiles might under other circumstances have been proper enough, yet when it was done in compliance with the wishes of those who regarded it as necessary to the obtaining of salvation, it was sinful, inasmuch as it gave countenance to a dangerous infringement of the great article of justification through the imputed righteousness of Christ alone. (see Gal. ii. 11.) We find also, that the Apostle Paul was exceedingly liberal and accommodating in relation to circumcision, so long as it was viewed as a matter of indifference. He circumcised Timothy to please the Jews. But whenever he found circumcision urged as a necessary part of a justifying righteousness he would submit to practice it no longer. He could not be compelled to circumcise Titus, "and that" says he, "because of false brethren unwares brought in, who came in privily

to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." Hence, if abstinence from ardent spirits, or any thing else which the Bible has left as a matter of indifference, should be enjoined upon us, by others, as essential to salvation, compliance on our part would be sinful, as it would be countenancing a method of salvation, at once derogatory to the glory of free grace, and subversive of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The reader will at once perceive that the whole of the foregoing remarks are so framed as to apply to all matters of indifference, and also that what has been said with a more direct reference in relation to ardent spirits will apply equally to all intoxicating liquors, such as wine, porter, beer, &c. If these are found to be abused to purposes of intoxication, and our use of them be a means of helping forward the evil, they should be abandoned, on the same principle on which we have advocated abstinence from the use of ardent spirits.

It may probably be expected, that we should now proceed to say something in relation to the TEMPERANCE SOCIETY, and to urge the propriety of becoming united with it. It must not, however, be inferred from any thing that has been said that we consider it a duty in persons to have their names enrolled as members of that society. Without doing so, they can practice on the principle of abstinence. Do persons regard the scriptures as a proper rule of *manners* as well as of *faith*? Then, in regard to the matter under consideration, the forming of themselves into *voluntary associations* is not necessary, is not enjoined. The course prescribed by the Apostle, in relation to all such matters, is plain. The saints at Rome and Corinth, when they received his mind on the subject of their christian liberty, no doubt, payed all due respect to his advice and example, in *their individual capacity* as *church members*, without forming themselves into any other association with unbelieving Jews and Gentiles, for that purpose. If we go and do likewise, I apprehend, the whole duty required of us will be performed.

Of the propriety of church members associating themselves with a Temperance Society, *out of the church* and *independent* of the church, we have our doubts. Our objections to such a course are like the following.

1. Because the church itself is *constitutionally* a Temperance Society. There is no duty, either civil, moral or religious, but is embraced in the very constitution of the

church. Whatever the word of God renders dutiful, her members are under a solemn obligation to perform. If *abstinence* in certain circumstances becomes a duty, it is the word of God that makes it so; and hence church members, by their christian profession, are bound to observe it. And if all church members were to perform their duty in this particular, an example would be set of tenfold greater influence, than can possibly be the case by any number of them uniting with an *extraneous* society, got up for the purpose of promoting that, which the church in her constitutional capacity is bound to promote. It is either the duty of a church member to join a Temperance Society, or it is not. But will any pretend to say that the word of God makes it a duty, in that church member, who has been convinced that abstinence is a duty and is practising accordingly, in conjunction with his fellow church members of the same congregation, to unite himself with a Temperance Society? If not, where is the propriety of his doing, what duty does not require to be done?

2. Because, church members in joining the Temperance Society are required to give a pledge, it may be, to *infidels*, on a subject which relates purely to *christian liberty*.—It will not be denied, that men of infamous principles and practices, *infidels*, *profane swearers*, *Sabbath-breakers* and such like, are not only members, but also officers in Temperance Societies. Now, "from such" the Bible would say "turn away. Have no fellowship with them further than necessity requires." If the christian say to them "my Bible teaches me that abstinence, in present circumstances, is a duty, that my christian liberty ought to be restrained, whenever the using of it is found to give offence;" they are ready to reply, "we care nothing about your Bible, we care nothing about your *christian liberty*, all we want of you is to come and put down your name to this paper, and thus give us a pledge that you will no longer burn yourself with the liquid fire." All this is virtually, if not really said. And if the christian complies, is he not in some measure guilty of making a compromise, derogatory to his high and holy profession? But it may be said "the Temperance Society is altogether of a civil nature and the christian joins it, not as a christian, but as a member of civil society, and therefore it is right for him to become associated with the vilest of characters for the purpose of promoting a civil good."—We answer, that the christian, who is described as being a *stranger and pilgrim on*

the earth, can never lay aside his christian character; whatever he does must be done in that character; his *civil* duties must be performed by him as a christian, and if he joins a Temperance Society it must be as a christian; and hence it must be as a christian that he associates his name with those of infidels, &c. and mingles with them in the same society. And all this in a case which is not necessary, and where the object in view might otherwise be more effectually obtained. For our own part, we are for having the line of demarkation, between the church and the world, distinctly drawn, and for maintaining a strict separation in all cases where it possibly can be done.

3. Because, uniting with the Temperance Society has the tendency to *villify* the church. It is in effect to say that the standard of morality in that society in relation to a particular case, is of a higher order, than that which obtains in the church. Is it not the common belief, that the profession made by the church does not require "total abstinence" from the use of ardent spirits; that this is only required by the Temperance Society? Hence that society is presented in a purer light than the church. If a member of the church take his seat to-day at the communion table of the Lord, would not his joining the temperance society to-morrow betoken some defect in point of moral duty and obligation, in the profession which he makes to-day? Now, the profession which we make as church members obligates us to practice *universal holiness*, to perform *every duty* which the holy law of God enjoins; would it therefore be proper in us to do any thing which would naturally tend to depreciate the perfect character of that profession, and thus vilify the church of God?

4. Because, for church members to join that society has a tendency to satisfy the consciences of others with whom they associate, in not making a public profession of religion. It is but too well known that outward *morality* is regarded by multitudes as all that is necessary to secure them everlasting happiness. And it is also well known that such persons generally regard *temperance* as the very essence of morality. Now has not that wonderful zeal, which is manifested in the establishment of temperance societies, the tendency to increase and confirm the delusion of these moralists? Especially when it is considered, that in the multitude of harangues delivered before these societies, the *virtue* of Temperance is extolled to the skies, while the gospel of the grace of God is scarcely mentioned? Besides, when all

the oratorical powers of preachers and others are put forth, in order to persuade people to give up their names, as members of the great temperance association, does not this, in their estimation, lessen the importance of making a public profession of religion? Is not their joining the one society urged with that vehemence, which gives it something like the character of a compromise for not joining the other? We should say, the more scriptural way would be, to urge, upon all, the duty of joining the church, and at the same time, give them to understand, that in so doing they will be uniting themselves to a temperance society of God's own institution. But to mention only another objection.

5. The temperance society gives rise to rash and uncharitable opinions. Because some members of the church may not conceive it to be their duty to become the advocates and members of such an institution, they are denounced as *suipicious characters*, as advocates of intemperance, &c. by others who may not have been troubled with the same conscientious scruples upon the subject. In this way, "offence is often given to the generation of God's children." On this point, however, there is no need of enlarging, as the evil is well known.

While, therefore, we consider that it is the duty of all church members to abstain from using ardent spirits, we dare not say, all things considered, that it would be dutiful, or even expedient, for them to attach themselves to the Temperance Society.—The above reasons against such a course are conclusive with the writer, whatever they may be with the reader. Let us add, the earnest prayer that the Associate Church may present herself to the world, not only in principle, but also in practice. **A TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.** M.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

A MAXIM OF BIBLE RELIGION.

(Continued from page 204.)

In the New-Testament, the same maxim is laid down, as in the Old for Christian life, through all its variety of believing and doing, in public and private, individual and collective capacity. It is still, *Go forward*. The departure, the way and the destination are all the same. No object on earth is too dear to leave, or too terrible to meet. No obstacle is so high that it cannot be surmounted, and no danger is so great that it is not to be hazarded by faith in the promise. I shall now adduce a few texts out of many to show that this is true.

First, The departure is the same, viz. from all sin. "And let every one that nameth the name of Jesus *depart from iniquity*." 2 Tim. ii. 19. Here observe, that as no particular iniquity is specified all must be included—all those "evil thoughts which proceed out of the heart," and all others, to which these naturally lead. This is to be done without respecting the number of those who still cleave to iniquity, or the various *pretences* to religion and to knowledge by which they try to cover it. "Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you." 2 Cor. iv. 17. As there is no exception here mentioned, so we are not to make any, but *depart*, if we should leave true believers—men of great talents—of extensive acquirements—and the whole world behind us, and although we should have few in company, or be literally *alone*. We are to *depart* at any expense whatever—at the expense of crosses, vexations, disappointments, and an endless variety of troubles; for "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me." Matth. x. 38—at the expense of denying ourselves any, or even all those gratifications and enjoyments which are in themselves harmless, and in other circumstances proper, and even dutiful. "Then said Jesus to his disciples, if any man *will come after me*, let him *deny himself*, and take up his cross and follow me," (Matth. xvi. 24.)—at the expense of relinquishing the nearest and dearest of human society, with all its delights, and even life itself. "If any man come to me and hate not his *father*, and *mother*, and *wife*, and *children*, and *brethren*, and *sisters*, yea, and his *own life*, also, he cannot be my disciple," (Luke. xiv. 26.)—and at the expense of *daily* making some sacrifices, or bearing some cross. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross *DAILY*, and follow me." Luke ix. 23. We are not to understand this departure as necessarily requiring all these things to be actually done by every one, but only, as he who builds a tower sits down first and counts the cost, so when we intend to depart from all iniquity, we ought to calculate that it *may* require all these things to be done, and if it should, that we are resolved to do them rather than *not depart*. We are to depart, without the prospect of any compensation in the kind of things we leave. It would not be much to leave all these things and make all these sacrifices and follow Christ, if so be that he

were promising the same things in greater measure. There are thousands without any love to Christ, and without leaving any sin, that make the greatest sacrifices, and hazard every thing dear when they have a hope to rise in wealth or power by that means; but there is no prospect of this kind here. Christ said, in reply to one who offered "to follow him whithersoever he would go," "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." Luke ix. 57, 58—intending that he should infer what kind of fare he was to expect in following him. "For it is enough if the servant be as his Lord, and the disciple as his master." We are to depart *immediately*; the shortest delay is unlawful. For when another said to him,— "Suffer me first to go and bury my father," Jesus said unto him, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." And as it is unlawful, so it is dangerous in the extreme. For when another said, "Lord, I will follow thee, but let me first go and bid them farewell that are at home," Jesus said unto him, "No man having put his hand to the plough and looketh back is fit for the kingdom of heaven," v. 59—62. What a fearful warning to take heed against delays, or tampering with our convictions of duty, and especially with our promises! Here was a person that promised fair to leave all and go to preach Christ's gospel, but he wished to go and spend a while first with his parents and friends at home. Carnal reason would say it was very natural and desirable, and a harmless indulgence; and it is a rare case if parents would not urge it, and all friends agree to it. But ye that plead for delays, listen to this; for it will be found true in the judgment, and many will witness to it in eternal torments. "He that putteth his hand to the plough (he has not yet started,) and *looketh back*, is not fit for the kingdom of heaven!" Awful sentence! It is to say they are reprobate silver—mere counterfeits. And frequently these persons do themselves confirm the truth of it in this life, to the conviction of all that know them.

Second. The way is the same. And, summarily, it is Christ himself. This is his own declaration: "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me." John xiv. 6. He is so by instruction, authority and example. That he is so by example, may be certainly inferred from the text already quoted, in speaking of our departure. If any more proof be necessary, it is found in these texts:—"Let this

mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus." Phil. ii. 5. "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." John ii. 6. "For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done unto you." John xiii. 15. "Because Christ hath suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps." 1 Peter, ii. 21. When therefore we are imitating him in his mind or manner of life, or any thing in which he is imitable, we are going forward. But as he is by office 'the captain of salvation, to lead many sons to glory,' that must be the way also which he authoritatively marks out for our steps; and following him whithersoever he goes as a pattern, and keeping his commandments must be the same thing, and both attest the character of his disciple. "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you;" and the sum of all his commands is to love God with all our heart, soul, strength and mind, and our neighbor as ourselves," and because the last necessarily implies the first, he says, "This is my commandment that ye love one another, as I have loved you." John xv. 12, 14. And again, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." ch. xiii. 35. But if we are truly following his example, and obeying him in the true spirit of this summary command, we must be conscientiously endeavoring to observe all things *whatsoever* he has commanded, without adding or diminishing in the least particular. Less than this would not consist with the sincerity of our love and the reality of our obedience. Thence it follows, that as his commands extend to every thing that belongs to *public, private* or *secret* religion, so in the performance of these, all these and only these, must be our daily progress *forward*, to the end of our journey—our Father's house of many mansions.

Our moving principle is one, and it is only and purely Faith. "For we walk by faith, not by sight." 2 Cor. v. 7. And we also "walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham." Rom. iv. 12. Without this very principle of faith that was in him, we cannot move forward a single hair's breadth, and if we attempt to move by any other, we certainly move backward. But what was Abraham's faith, and what did he believe? The principle of it is a sovereign gift of God, which he giveth as he wills, and to whom he wills, and it is the effect of the supernatural almighty agency of the Holy Ghost, which he infallibly and effectually produces in the soul on the day of regeneration, by

the word. Eph. ii. 8. Gal. v. 22. "Abraham believed God." Gen. xv. 6. He believed *whatever* God said, however incomprehensible and mysterious, and seemingly impossible it might be, and he believed *BECAUSE* it was God that said it. Now God has spoken unto us by his Son, Heb. i. 2. therefore it is faith to believe whatsoever the Son of God has said to us personally, or by his servants the Apostles, and *because* he has said it. Here again Christ is the way, comprehending all the truth he hath taught concerning the mind and will of God for our salvation, whether by word or deed, as prophet, priest and king. Many refuse to go in this way precisely as it is laid out in the chart of the Bible, because it makes God absolutely sovereign in his decrees; makes man too humble—he must go stooping from first to last; because it leaves no room for lust of any name; or because it is cavilled at, and after altering it to suit their own pleasure, they set forward, publishing as they go, we are Bible christians. But Bible faith, be assured, aims sincerely and constantly at taking this way, *as laid down*, without any the least alteration or variation in any point; and when it *has* taken it, it will keep it unto the last extremity; it will sooner part with every thing under heaven, and meet death in any form. And so true is this, that Christ has staked the character of disciple upon it. "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings." John xiv. 24. "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." ch. viii. 31. The New-Testament is as peremptory and absolute in requiring us to go forward in this way, as it is with respect to our first setting out. Although all sorts of difficulties, snares and temptations attend it, from its entrance to its end, yet are we commanded to "enter in at the straight gate," and having entered, "to press forward to the mark." "Laying aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset us, we are to run—" If enemies of all sorts, of man and devil kind, in huge numbers, should meet us, we are not to give back an inch of ground. At such a crisis the Spirit of God gives out this terrible warning—"If any man draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Heb. x. 38. For such an occasion, these words point out the way to go forward—"Take unto you the whole armor of God." "Fight the good fight of faith. Contend *carnestly* for the faith once delivered to the saints." "Strive *together* for the faith of the gospel, nothing *terrified* by the adversaries." Eph. vi. 13. 1 Tim.

vi. 12. Jude, 3. Phil. i. 27, 28. And if it should seem at any time impracticable for us to make desirable progress, then are we to bring forth all the spiritual energies of our soul to stand our ground. We are to "hold fast that which we have,"—"resist unto blood, (that is, our own, not the blood of others,) striving against sin." "Having done all to stand, we are to stand having our loins girt," &c.

Again, if wise, learned, talented and pious preachers of a new and better or easier way, should accost us with good words and fair speeches, or a great show of zeal for the Bible, we are not so much as to *stop* to hear what they have to say. The Galatians did only this, and see what reproofs. "Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" Observe here, that he holds "running well," and "obeying the truth," to be the same thing. "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should not obey the truth?" "Are ye so foolish, having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" ch. iii. 1, 3. ch. v. 7. Sometimes there is a flagging of the spirit under the severe and lengthened corrections of the hand of God, through the violent struggling of the flesh for life, so that the soul feels on the point of fainting; still we are not to stop in a single point of profession or practice, but "to lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees, and make straight paths for our feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way." Heb. xii. 12, 13. To prove at once that this is the maxim, and has been since the world began, to go forward, in the steps of faith in all possible cases of difficulty and danger, I have only to refer the reader to Heb. xi. to examine for himself the cases there recorded. I shall call up only one passage more, as to the way, viz. Phil. iii. 12—16. And because it is of prime importance to the full elucidation of the maxim, I would bespeak a patient attention to it. In the first part of the chapter he gives an account of some of those considerations on which, in the days of his unregeneracy, he much valued himself. But upon his becoming savingly acquainted with Christ, he formed that very different opinion of them which he gives from verse 7 to 11 inclusive. This was a great attainment, and far beyond the common measure of believers; but it was not so far as to satisfy him, and as in duty he was bound to go; therefore, he adds verse 12, "not as though I had already attained either were already perfect, but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for

which, also, I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Here plainly the apostle makes our maxim, that of his whole life. He is to 'follow after,' equivalent to *go forward*, until he should reach that for which Christ took hold of him by his renewing grace, viz. eternal life. Since his conversion and first setting out, he had made great additional attainments in holy progress, in labours, in knowledge, in sufferings, and experience. But after all this he still says, 'Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended,' while some might be accounting greatly of him. This was his humble account of his own progress. And he adds, 'But this one thing I do; forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth to those which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.' Here he alludes to the races in the Grecian games, in which a prize was held forth to him who first reached the end of the course, which in the apostle's race would be only at the end of his mortal life, when this earthly house would dissolve.

I would call the readers attention to two things in these words, first, '*forgetting the things which are behind*.' What things does he forget? Will any take countenance from this to say, that in order to press forward in the course of christian improvement we must cast early attainments behind us, in other words, in order to keep up in the march of improvement characteristic of our time, we must let the attainments made by our fathers at the reformation, pass into oblivion, as unfit to occupy the attention of this enlightened age? This opinion has surely nothing in common with the meaning of our Apostle. The first visit of mercy to his soul, his *first views* of Christ crucified, and of the way of salvation by him, which he preached at Damascus after his conversion, he never forgot. The doctrines which he first learned were those which he preached to the last, he had no new discoveries to make in the condition of fallen man, or in the way of his recovery by Jesus Christ, that would disagree with or supercede what he had attained at the first. The first and second chaps. of Gal. and the first of first Tim. may satisfy any unprejudiced mind of the truth of this. Let this one word suffice for all, 'though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel to you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.' But the 16th verse of the passage under consideration, settles this question forever. 'Nevertheless whereunto we have *already attained*, let us walk

by the same rule, let us mind the *same thing*.' In teaching the doctrines of the gospel, he speaks of '*leaving the principles* of the doctrine of Christ,' that he might go on unto perfection, and teach those things that were built upon them, Heb. vi. 1 but neither is that which he means in this place. But those things enumerated in the beginning of the chapter, or near it, and all others which once he had before him, as objects of great esteem, but now counted loss for Christ, these are the kind of things to which he has turned his back, and endeavors daily to *forget*, as things he has left forever, and the *forgetting of which* is necessary to his pressing forward to the mark. The second thing deserving notice is the strong term used to denote his progress forward. '*I press toward the mark*.' It is used to signify the pressing forward of the huntsman toward the game. It is also used to denote the violent and wicked measures by which the bloody persecutor presses upon his helpless victim. In which case the force of the term plainly is, that he will stick at nothing that he may accomplish his ends. The sense is greatly different in this case, but the force of the term is the same. It was *so to* press forward to the mark, as *nothing of an earthly consideration* should stop him. He was to press forward as one whose all was at stake. He was making his escape from eternal ruin, and he was pressing forward to a crown of life that was never to fade away, and a kingdom incorruptible. This was his rule and he enjoins us to follow him and be like minded, and count all things that would hold us back or hinder us in our progress, loss and dung. And this agrees with the strong language in which christian duty is often expressed, such as forsaking all—cutting off a right hand, plucking out a right eye—running—striving—fighting, &c. It agrees with the glorious and perfect example of Christ, to whom we are continually to look both for direction and strength, he set his face like a flint and refused to be ashamed. He endured the cross and despised the shame. He did not fail nor was discouraged until he reached his mark, which was the glory of his Father and the redemption of his church. I shall now bring forward a few texts to illustrate that the destination or end of the course is also the same.

1st. It is generally denominated *glory* in the following passage "For it became him by whom are all things and for whom are all things in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering," Heb. ii. 10. We have

already seen repeatedly, that our course is to follow Christ whithersoever he goes, and this is that to which he leads.—It is “his Father’s house in which are many mansions,” into which he will lead them all at last, where they shall be with him forever, “to behold his glory.” This is that “city which hath foundations,” and that “heavenly country,” to which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob at last arrived.

2d. In one of its particulars, it is described in the following passage, “Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,” Eph. iv. 13. To bring us to this is the end of the ministry, and all the ordinances of the gospel; and when the elect of God arrive at this, these ordinances and this ministry will cease. To this point, the Apostle urges the Corinthians in the most solemn and impressive manner, to direct their course, and against yielding to any thing that would turn them from it. “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment,” 1 Cor. i. 10. This we certainly know is the mark, but it is a *question* to be answered by those that contend so stoutly for visible fellowship on *fence terms*, or terms that stand between truth and falsehood, whether their course lead to it or not?

3d. In another of its particulars, it is described in the following, “According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be *holy* and without *blame*, before him in love,” Eph. i. 4. When the church of elect believers shall all have arrived at this perfect holiness, the mystery of God will be finished, his purpose fully accomplished, and therefore it must be the end of all their believing, praying, hoping and pressing forward; and then the present economy and means of grace will come to an end. This same holiness is represented as the end of Christ’s ministry. ‘Even as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.’”

4th. The body, as well as the soul, has its own proportion in this destination. It shall arrive at a glorious immortality. This the Apostle was pressing after.—“If by any

means I might attain unto the *resurrection* of the dead,” Phil. 3. 11. ‘For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality—then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory,’ 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54. Every child of God having in him the same holy Spirit of him who raised Christ from the dead, hath a pledge, an earnest within him, that God shall also quicken his mortal body, Rom. viii. 11. Christ repeatedly informs us, John vi, that he ‘will raise it up at the last day.’ And after what manner, the Apostle tells us in the same, 3d ch. Phil. v. 21. ‘who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like *unto his glorious body*, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.’ That will be the end of its sickness, weariness, hunger and thirst, pain and distress, it shall sit down to eternal rest in its Father’s house.

5th. The state of immediate, visible and glorious society with Christ Jesus in heaven, is another view of our journey’s end; and this was what the Apostle had in his eye when he says, ‘For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ which is far better,’ Phil. i. 23. ‘We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord,’ 2 Cor. v. 8. This is said of the soul only, and it takes place at death; but the following prediction includes both soul and body, ‘For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we *ever be with the Lord*.’ 1 Thess. 4. 16, 17.

6th. As the coming of our Lord from heaven, is to be the grand signal that our pilgrimage is just at a close, we are to look forward to that great event, from our first setting out until we behold him. Once more, Phil. iii. ‘For our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look (are looking, always looking) for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.’ v. 20, ‘denying all ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world. *LOOKING* for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, and (or even) our Saviour Jesus Christ,’ Tit. ii. 12. 13.

In a word, the sum of the whole Christian’s travel, is this ‘*LOOKING* for and *HAST-*

ING unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire, shall be dissolved and the elements melt with fervent heat,' 2 Pet. 3. 12. And the true spirit of Zion's travellers will ever incline them to say amid all the attractions with which this world could allure them, 'Even so come Lord Jesus, come quickly.' I have now endeavored to prove, or rather only to show that this maxim runs through the whole Bible. I shall next try to point out some of the cases to which it applies.

—
SKETCH of the LIFE of the celebrated FRANCIS TURRETTINE, Professor of Divinity at Geneva, who died anno 1687. Translated from B. PICTET's Latin Oration, delivered before the Academy of Geneva, when he ascended the Theological Chair, in the room of Turretine, his Uncle.

[Continued from page 243.]

Turretine was a modest divine, if ever there was one. As at mount Sinai the Lord set bounds to the curiosity of the Israelites, so there are certain limits fixed by God to human knowledge in this world; and some things in the Scriptures over which Jehovah has thrown a veil, and which we will not and cannot know, till we see Christ as he is. He had continual heaviness in his heart, because he saw all things in the world and church growing worse and worse. He saw, with the utmost concern, the coat of Christ torn to pieces; the progress and increase of error; the apostacy of many from the reformed religion, either through a cowardly or avaricious spirit; the awful mysteries of Christianity weighed in the balance of depraved reason, and sported with by petty philosophers and profane infidels; the introduction of a flood of Arian, Socinian, and Arminian errors, nay, of the horrors of Atheism. These things made him almost shed tears of blood. He admired, but did not seek to comprehend the deep things of God; and he was wont to tell his pupils, with awful solemnity, that it was the province of a mad philosophy, and an evidence of a bold, impious spirit, to seek farther than the plain decisions or native consequences of revelation.

Turretine lived as he believed, and walked as he taught. He was foremost in every thing lovely, grave and of good report. He was not like those who speak as angels and walk as men. What Nazianzen said of Athanasius was eminently true of Turretine: He was low in his opinion of

himself, but sublime in all his actions. Though Turretine wished to do actions worthy of praise, yet he did not court the applause of men; nor did he ever thrust himself forward to public observation. A well earned reputation he did not decline; but he neither studiously sought it, nor built it on the ruins of another man's. As far as can be observed, he never acted to please himself. All he did was for the glory of Christ, the good of the church, and especially for the advantage of his pupils, who were dear to him as his own soul. Turretine was not like many divines, who despise every thing but their own productions; who defend an opinion, not because it is true, but because it is their own; who measure themselves by themselves, and are not wise. His authority was never stretched too far. He might have enjoined, but, for love's sake, he rather besought. His mind was the very seat of candour, and consequently a stranger to those little jealousies and unsanctified heats that disgrace the religion of Jesus. He was not an evil speaker, nor soon angry at an opposing brother. His character, in this instance, was the reverse of Jerome's, and other great men mentioned in church history, who, on all occasions, treated their antagonists with the utmost severity of manner, and acrimony of style, and thus injured rather than promoted their cause. Our deceased friend was a great lover of peace. He often said, that the ministers of the gospel of peace ought not to be the heralds of war; and that the trumpet of Zion should not be sounded to excite contention among saints. He often lamented, that in time of common danger divines should, by their petty squabbles, open the gates to the enemies of truth.

Turretine did not, through envy, look with an evil eye upon the excellence and reputation of other men. He was a real friend to humanity, and to humanity in affliction. Nothing excelled his beneficence, but the happy way of his discovering it. The widow and the fatherless, the orphan and the stranger, found in him a patron and defender. He was, in fact, what the Scriptures and the fathers of the church say a bishop should be, given to hospitality, and a lover of the poor. As Olympiodorus speaks, he did not measure his bounty by his wealth, but from the largeness of his affection to the needy. His house was a kind of home to every religious stranger that visited Geneva, and none left his house without profit; for he reckoned with Titus and Frederic I. that a day was lost in which he had done no

good. Turretine was very laborious in study; his mind was always on the stretch. His study was his pleasure and recreation.

In a short time after he was made professor of divinity, he was called to the rectorship of this academy. This office he discharged for many years, with much credit to himself, and advantage to the republic, and delivered anniversary orations in the fullest assembly of the Genevans, on topics worthy of a man of God, and of a polite and religious audience, viz:—On the origin or birth-day of the School and Academy; On the election of Pope Alexander VII; On the union between virtue and truth; and On the prejudices that hinder the spread of the gospel.

In the year 1662, another office of great honor and difficulty was imposed upon Turretine. When the walls of this city were to be repaired, and the expense was found more than the state could bear, it was agreed to seek the assistance of the Swiss Cantons, and of the United States of Holland; and none was reckoned more fit for this embassy than the son of Benedict Turretine, who had been more than forty years before sent for the same purpose. Francis Turretine left Geneva in the month of May. His reception at Basle was very flattering; the divines of that seminary vied with each other in testifying their great affection for him. From thence he went to Holland, where their High Mightinesses received him very cordially; and, as a token of their esteem, honoured him with a golden chain, and a large piece of plate. Turretine could never forget the attentions he received in Holland, especially the marked regard of that miracle of our age, the Prince of Orange. His embassy succeeded to his wish; and if we are silent, the fortifications of the city will cry out. It is unnecessary here to narrate how much the churches in Holland, especially the church at the Hague, wished to have this luminary of the Reformation again among them. But their attempts to recall him were fruitless. He left them; and from a strong love to Geneva, broke through every entanglement of honor, affection and grief. He continued, however, to correspond with the great and good men of that country to the day of his death. Turretine, taking another route on his way home, travelled through Germany, and returned home by the way of Paris. Thither he went to congratulate his old preceptors. Those of them who were alive, rejoiced to see their former scholar, now wiser than his teachers. He preached twice to most crowded audien-

ces in the church of Charenton, which, alas! is now no more. At that time he became acquainted with the matchless John Claude, the glory and eminent defender of the Reformation, whose character is far above my praise. Turretine returned safely home, and was received with open arms by all his countrymen. The city and church, though at that time in mourning on account of the death of the great Leger, were comforted by the arrival and presence of Turretine.

He returned to his work with greater alacrity than ever. In the year 1668, he was again Rector of this academy, and, with his usual judgment and eloquence, delivered an oration on the preservation of Geneva, and the evils and scandals of the church. Nothing was now wanting to his external happiness but a consort. He married, about this time, Elizabeth de Masse, a most illustrious virgin. She brought him one daughter, and three sons. Only one of the sons is now alive, and seems in every respect worthy of such a father.

In the year 1664, Turretine refuted the letter of the Pope, and vindicated the Reformation from the cavils and reproaches of its enemies. In 1666 he published his disputations concerning the satisfaction of Christ, against Socinus and his hell-hatched brood. In the year 1674 he corrected his celebrated system. With this system every divine ought to be acquainted, otherwise he will fight in the dark against the enemies of the truth. Turretine long hesitated whether he should publish his great work. He knew that the world was already filled with books of this kind, and that the taste of the age was fonder of books that fed the fancy than instructed the mind. His love of truth and the cause of Christ, however, prevailed over his inclination, and that work, so long desired by the public, was published, and gratified their fullest expectations. He received letters from many learned divines, testifying their approbation of his views of divine truth. He published his Sermons the same year, which are in almost every body's possession. In the year 1668 he revised and published his Disputations anew, and added ten new ones to that edition. He had begun to revise part of his System, when he was taken to heaven by the Sovereign Head of the church.

This man, who feared God greatly, had been long bowed down to the grave with grief, on account of the melancholy state of the reformed churches. As was said of Basil, so we may say of Turretine:—"While others regard only their own things, and see

only what is among their own feet, or what concerns their own interest, he went farther, his spirit trembled for every thing done against Christ's spouse; in every thing he was moderate, but in this knew no bounds; when truth lay in the street, when the members of Christ were scattered, he could take no sleep, his soul was rent with anguish." How often have we heard him groaning, and seen him weeping over the massacres of Piedmont, and when he beheld the miserable remains of our brethren there? How often was his face foul with weeping at the state of the Protestant churches in France, who are now the sport of bigotted priests and faithless tyrants? With what feeling did he repeat the latter part of the 80th Psalm? Great God, thou hearest these groans, thou sawest these tears. And ye, my hearers, have seen him in tears when bewailing the churches of Christ. The Lord hath now wiped all his tears away: and thus we come to the concluding scene of his life.

Turretine's health had been long very good. If the strictest temperance, and an unshaken mind could have ensured a long life, he had lived long indeed! We seldom saw him sick. He was sometimes subjected to a colic, and twice felt the excruciating pains of the gout. We promised ourselves a long possession of such an invaluable treasure; but it was determined otherwise. Turretine's great soul could dwell no longer in the frail tenement of the body! On the 26th September, 1687, the day in which he was first confined to bed, he rose very early, long before the rising of the sun, and wrote letters to some of his dearest friends in the church; as to Heidegger and Peter Jurieu, the luminaries of the age in which they lived, and would have written more, but his strength failed him. He conversed, that day, about the interests of the kingdom of Christ, with several of his friends, till 10 o'clock, when, on a sudden, he felt the approach of the last enemy. O, happy day, that found him so employed! As soon as he felt himself seized with this sickness unto death, his mind, looking into futurity, augured the issue, and he did not choose to conceal it from his dear sister. Whenever I heard of his distress, I hastened to his bedside, and was thus accosted by my much esteemed uncle. "The time is now come, when, to my inexpressible joy, I will be delivered from the prison of the body, and am only sorry, that, through my great affliction, I cannot pray as I ought to my eternal Father. I know, however, whom I have be-

lieved, and whom I will trust, while I have any being. My soul pants, through all its powers, for Christ, and none but Christ. This I earnestly beg of God, that, having forgiven all my sins, he would give me strength and patience to bear my trouble, and give me an easy passage to a blessed immortality." The most skilful physicians in Geneva were called, in order to relieve, if they could not remove the disorder. While they were exerting all their skill, he was addressing himself to the great judge of all, in the words of David, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant;" and, "O Christ, wash my soul in thy blood." "Hear, Father, the powerful voice of his blood," &c. On the following day, the physicians, with great concern, informed us, that all the powers of medicine could give him no relief. We hoped for his recovery, and stood weeping around him. He, collected in himself and prepared for all events, said to us, why do you weep? The way of death must be trod once by all. The life we now live, is not life; it is the abode of sin; a sea of cares; a school of sorrow; it is death itself. The life which I am soon to live, is only worthy of the name. O! when shall I leave this habitation of sin, this field of affliction? O! when shall I be dissolved in death, be master of myself, and enjoy eternal happiness in the presence of Christ? The last day he lived, he spoke many affecting things to his son, (Alphonsus) and, among other things, gave in charge the four following:—The care of the church of God, if ever he was a minister; a love of truth, humility and charity. And when I stood beside him, he exhorted me, in the strongest expressions, to diligence in the work of the Lord. Many things he said, which grief permits me not to utter, but which I shall never forget while I live. Towards the evening, he was observed to decline rapidly; but he told us, he would not die that night, but would see the light of another day! We all admired his patience in his trouble; and if at any time, through the force of his distress, an impatient word escaped him, he instantly returned to himself and praised the infinite mercies of God. The next morning he knew his dissolution was near. "The day is now come," cried he, "when I shall go forth to meet my Saviour. Farewell, cruel absence, forever!" Michael Turretine, a dear relation of the deceased, and professor of oriental languages in the academy, came to see his dying friend. He bore witness to the truth of religion; confessed he had been a great sin-

ner, and needed much repentance unto life; but declared, that he had the fullest assurance of the remission of his sins through Christ; that he embraced the divine mercy with all his heart, and, as a dying man, begged of God that he would wash him in the blood of the Lamb, and receive him now into the mansions of the blessed. He recommended to him the church, the academy, and his son. He begged of him to salute the senate in his name; and to tell them that he died in the same faith in which he had lived, and which he had taught; to exhort the brethren in the ministry to lay aside all guile and differences, and strive together for the faith of the gospel, and in the work of the Lord; to live mindful of their common order, character, office, mortality, and the account they must render of their stewardship at the tremendous tribunal of God!

We continued praying, and when one said: Let us go to the throne of grace, he cried out, as if impatient of delay, Let us go, let us go! His face was not like that of a dying man, but of one that was triumphing! He seemed to be in heaven, not on earth. Immediately after this, he gave us his last benediction, commending us to God with all his heart, and without any convulsion of his body, without any contortion of his face or eyes, he fell asleep in Jesus. Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord!

Thus died Turretine, aged 64 years. God grant that we all may be enabled to live as he did, and to die in like manner! Amen.

[From the Christian Magazine.]

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,
CONFIRMED AND ILLUSTRATED BY PAS-
SAGES OF JOSEPHUS, THE JEWISH HISTO-
RIAN.

(Continued from page 237.)

Of Herod the Tetrarch of Galilee, and of John the Baptist.—This Herod was the son of Herod the Great, and Cleopatra of Jerusalem. We have already seen from Josephus, that by his father's testament, which was confirmed by Augustus, he was appointed tetrarch of Galilee. This is the Herod who is mentioned by the evangelists, in their account of the public ministry of John the Baptist, and of Christ. Though he is once called *king*, by Mark, (vi. 14,) by following the Jewish style, yet his proper title, *tetrarch*, is given him by Matthew, (xiv. 1.) and by Luke, (iii. 1;) and all of them uniformly represent Galilee, not Judea, as the country over which he had jurisdic-

tion. Josephus informs us, that when Tiberius succeeded to the Roman empire, and continued Herod and Philip in their *tetrarchies*, they both built cities in honor of the Emperor.* Particularly, "Herod the tetrarch, who was in great favor with Tiberius, built a city of the same name with him, and called it *Tiberias*. He built it in the best part of Galilee, at the lake of Gennesareth."† This city is mentioned, in the same position, by John, (vi. 1. 23.) and the sea of Galilee is called also the sea of Tiberias, because this city was built upon its shore.‡ It may also be mentioned here,

* Jewish Wars, b. ii. ch. ix. § 1.

† Antiq. b. xviii. ch. ii. § 3.

‡ The sea of Galilee is the same with what is called the lake of Gennesaret, Luk v. i. Josephus gives it the name of *sea*, (Jewish Wars, b. iii. ch. x. § 1.) It was customary, not only with the Hebrews, but also the Greeks, the Romans, and even the Belgians, to give the name of *sea*, as well as that of *lake*, to any large collection of water. This lake was called the sea of Galilee, because it was within that country. It was commonly called the lake or sea of Gennesaret, by the people who lived near it, because the country of Gennesaret lay along its banks, towards the north and west. It came to be called the sea of Tiberias, after this city was built upon its south-west point.

As this lake and the surrounding country were the same where many of our Lord's miracles were performed, and his discourses were delivered, the following description of it may be added from Josephus: "Its breadth is forty furlongs, and its length one hundred and forty; its waters are sweet and very agreeable for drinking, for they are finer than thick waters of other fens. The lake is also pure, and on every side ends directly at the shores and at the sand. It is also of a temperate nature, when you draw it up, and of a more gentle nature than river and fountain water, and yet always cooler than one would expect in so dissipated a place as this. There are several kinds of fish in it, different both to the taste and the sight from those elsewhere. The country also that lies over against this lake, hath the same name of Gennesareth; its nature is wonderful, as well as its beauty. Its soil is so fruitful that all sorts of trees can grow upon it, and the inhabitants accordingly plant all sorts of trees there; for the temper of the air is so well mixed that it agrees very well with those several sorts; particularly walnuts, which require the coldest air, flourish there in vast plenty; there also are palm trees, which grow best in hot air; fig trees also, and olives, grow near them, which yet require an air that is most temperate. One may call this the ambition of nature, where it forces those plants that are naturally enemies to one another, to agree together. It is a happy contention of the seasons, as if every one of them laid claim to this country; for it not only nourishes different sorts of autumnal fruit beyond men's expectation, but preserves them a great while. It supplies men with the principal fruits, with grapes and figs, continually during ten months of the year, and the rest of the fruits as they become ripe through the whole year.

Jewish Wars, b. iii. ch. x § 7. 8.

that one of the cities which Philip, Herod's brother, built to the honor of Tiberias, was situated at the fountains of Jordon, north from the lake of Gennesareth, and called by him *Cesarea*.^{*} There are two places called *Cesarea* in the New Testament. The one of these was built by Herod the Great, at a place formerly called *Strato's Tower*, and named by him *Cesarea*, in honor of *Agustus Cæsar*. It was situated on the shore of the Mediterranean sea, between *Joppa* and *Dora*, 600 furlongs north-west from *Jerusalem*. This is the place which is mentioned in *Acts* x. i. xii. 19. xxi. 8. xxiii. 23. &c. The other city of this name is that which was built by Philip, Tetrarch of *Iturea* and *Trachonitis*, and on this account it is often called *Cæsarea Philippi*, or the *Cæsarea* of Philip. It is thus distinguished by the evangelists, in their account of the journeys of our Lord, *Matth.* xvi. 13. *Mark* viii. 27. The same distinction we find marked by *Josephus*, when he says that *Vespasian* "removed from that *Cesarea* which was by the sea-side, and went to that which is called *Cæsarea Philippi*."[†]

Three of the evangelists give an account of the incestuous marriage of Herod with *Herodias*, his brother's wife, *Matth.* xiv. 1. 12. *Mark* vi. 17—22. *Luke* iii. 19. This fact is related by *Josephus*, in the following manner: "Herod the tetrarch had married the daughter of *Aretas*, (the king of *Arabia Petrea*) and had lived with her a great while; but when he was once at *Rome*, he lodged with Herod, his brother by the father's side. However he fell in love with *Herodias*, this last Herod's wife; ventured to talk with her about marriage, which address when she admitted, an agreement was made for her to change her habitation, and come to him as soon as he should return from *Rome*; one article of this marriage was also this, that he should divorce *Aretas's* daughter."[‡] And in the following chapter, which contains a genealogical account of the Herodian family, he says, "Herodias was married to Herod, the son of Herod the Great, by *Mariamne*. They had a daughter, *Salome*; after whose birth Herodias took upon her to confound the laws of our country, left her husband then living, and was married to Herod, the tetrarch of *Galilee*, her husband's brother, by the father's side." This account agrees with that of the evangelists, in the name of the woman whom Herod married, the rela-

tion in which she stood to his brother, and her having a daughter by her first marriage; and *Josephus* expresses the same judgment of the unlawfulness of the connection. The only seeming disagreement is as to the name of *Herodias's* first husband, who is called *Herod* by *Josephus*, but *Philip* by the evangelists. But this difference is easily accounted for. There is no reason to suppose, that the evangelists speak here of Philip the tetrarch, who is mentioned in *Luke*, iii. 1. but another of the sons of Herod the Great, who also bore this name. There is every reason to think, that *Herodias's* first husband bore the names both of Herod and Philip. It was common in those times for persons to have two names, and sometimes to be called by the one, and sometimes by the other. Thus, in the New Testament, we read of *Lebbeus*, whose surname was *Thaddeus*, *Thomas*, which is called *Dydymus*, and *Simon*, who was called *Niger*. Herod the Great had children by different wives, and *Josephus* mentions three of his sons under the name of Herod, so that it was necessary that they should bear additional names, by which they were distinguished from one another. According to *Josephus*,^{*} Herod the tetrarch was called Herod Antipas, and there is reason to suppose that his brother was called Herod Philip.[†]

This unlawful marriage was the occasion of the death of John the Baptist, on which account it is introduced by the evangelists. The testimony of *Josephus* already given is sufficient to establish the credibility of the history of the New Testament, respecting the whole of this matter. But there does not seem sufficient reason for questioning the genuineness of what follows in *Josephus*, respecting John Baptist. In this he declares, that John was a good man; that he inculcated righteousness and piety; that he baptized; and that the Jews came in crowds to him, and were much moved by his words; but that Herod, fearing his great influence over the people, imprisoned and put him to death.

Before leaving this part of the subject, it may be proper to take notice of two disastrous events, which *Josephus* mentions as befalling Herod, by way of punishment on account of his conduct. The first was the destruction of his army by *Aretas*, who made

^{*} Antiq. b. xviii. ch. ii. § 1.

[†] Jewish Wars, b. iii. ch. ix. § 7.

[‡] Antiq. b. xviii. ch. v. § 1.

^{*} Ant. b. xviii. ch. v. § 1.

[†] Whitby quotes different Jewish chronicles which agree with the evangelists in calling *Herodias's* first husband Philip. Annot. on *Matth.* xiv. 3.

war upon him on account of the injury which he had done to his daughter."* The second was his banishment. For Agrippa, his brother's son, having obtained the title of *King*, Herodias never ceased importuning her husband, until he agreed to sail to Rome, for the purpose of soliciting equal dignity; but the Emperor Caius Caligula, instead of granting this request, deprived Herod of his tetrarchy, and condemned both him and Herodias to perpetual banishment, in Lyons, a city in Gaul.†

Of the Pharisees and the Sadducees.—According to the accounts both of the evangelists and of Josephus, the Pharisees and Sadducees were the two principal religious sects into which the Jews were divided.—Their descriptions of the opinions and practices of these sects do likewise agree. "The Pharisees," says Josephus, "appear more religious than others. They value themselves highly upon the exact skill they have in the law of their fathers, and make men believe they are highly favored by God.—They pay respect to such as are in years, nor contradict them in any thing which they have introduced. They have delivered to the people a great many observances, by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the laws of Moses. They say that all souls are immortal, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies; but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment."‡ By these means they have the multitude on their side, and gratify their ambition, covetousness and vain glory.§ Of the sect of the Sadducees he says, that their "notions are quite contrary to those of the Pharisees—They reject those observances which are only derived from the tradition of forefathers. They take away fate entirely, and suppose that God is not concerned in our actions.—They also take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul, and the punishments and rewards in Hades. Concerning these things it is that great disputes and differences have arisen among them, while the Sadducees are able to persuade none but the rich, and have not the populace obsequious to them."¶ It is unnecessary to refer to particular places of the New Testament, as

the agreement between it and the above account must be apparent at first view.

After considering the state of parties among the Jews, we might be apt to be surprised when we read, in the Acts of the Apostles, (ch. v. 17.) that the high priest was of the sect of the Sadducees. And in fact, Josephus informs us, that when the Sadducees become magistrates, they addict themselves to the notions of the Pharisees because the multitude would not otherwise bear them."* Yet he gives an account of two high priests who were Sadducees; John Hyrcanus, who died 107 years before the christian æra, and Ananus the younger, who lived a short time after the transaction referred to in the Acts †

[To be continued.]

[For the Religious Monitor.]

MR. EDITOR.

I lately found a short account of a revival which seems to be genuine. It is almost a perfect contrast to the spurious work of modern times. To me it is the more interesting, because it was in the bounds of the church of Scotland. Who knows if the Lord will not yet return to that once famous church and have mercy in the midst of deserved judgment. Surely such an event would be most welcome to the few scattered friends of the covenanted Reformation. I send it for insertion if you think it suitable. A leaf at the beginning is torn which will nearly make all the preface a blank.

EGO.

Moulin, Sept. 1st. 1800.

MY DEAR SIR,

I was by no means surprised to find by your late letters that the communications which I made to you from time to time concerning the state of religion in this part of the country had been highly gratifying to our friends at Edinburgh. As you have signified to me ———. The inhabitants of the Highlands have, as you know, the scriptures in Galic, their native tongue. The New Testament, the Book of Psalms and the Assembly's shorter catechism, have been long read in the schools. By these means the people in this part of the country, had some knowledge of the principal events in the history of the creation and fall of man, and of Our Saviour's life, death, resurrection and ascension. They knew also some of

* Ant. b. xviii. ch. v. § 2.

† Ant. b. xviii. ch. vii.

‡ Jewish Wars, b. i. ch. v. § 2. Ant. xvii. ch. ii. § 4. b. xviii. ch. i. § 2. b. xiii. ch. x. § 6. Jewish Wars, b. ii. ch. viii. § 14.

§ Ut supra.

¶ Ut supra.

* Ant. b. xviii. ch. i. § 4.

† b. xiii. ch. x. § 6. 7. b. xx. ch. ix. § 1. Although John Hyrcanus in disgust left the Pharisees, yet it is not certain from Josephus that he adopted all the opinions of the Sadducees.

the great outlines of christian doctrine. But in general their knowledge of the principles of christianity was superficial and confused, and their religious opinions were in many important points erroneous. Very few indeed knew the way, in which the gospel informs us a sinner may be reconciled to God. The opinion of their own work recommending them to the favor of God, and procuring a reward from his bounty, was almost universal. They were not indeed addicted to open vice, if we except lying and swearing. They were rather distinguished for sobriety, industry, and peaceable behaviour. But they were destitute of religious principle. Our people were strangers alike to the true fear and the true love of God. They had evidently little concern about the present or the future state of their souls. They attended church and partook of the sacrament, and rested from their work on the Sabbath. But these outward observances were almost the only appearance of religion. There was little reading of the Scripture at home; little religious instruction of children; hardly any family worship; no religious conversation; no laboring in any manner for the meat which endureth unto everlasting life. Even on the Lord's day most of the time was spent in loitering, visiting and worldly talk, and on other days religion was scarcely thought of. In narrating the means by which the people were brought to pay a more serious attention to their eternal happiness, it is necessary to say something of my own case. I was settled a minister of this parish in 1786, at the age of twenty-two. Although I was not a despiser of what was sacred, yet I felt nothing of the power of religion on my soul. I had no relish for its exercises, nor any enjoyment in the duties of my office, public or private. A regard to character and a desire of being acceptable to my people, if not the only were certainly the principal motives that prompted me to any measure of diligence or exertion. I was quite well pleased when a diet of catechising was ill attended, because my work was sooner over; and I was always satisfied with the reflection that if the people were not able, or did not choose to attend on these occasions, that was not a fault of mine. I well remember that I often hurried over that exercise with a good deal of impatience, that I might get home in time to join some dancing party, or to read a sentimental novel. My public addresses and prayers were for the most part cold and formal. They were little regarded by the hearers at the time, and as little

recollected afterwards. I preached against particular vices and inculcated particular virtues; but I had no notion of the necessity of a radical change of principle; for I had not learned to know the import of those assertions of scripture "The carnal mind is enmity against God;" that "if any man be in Christ he is a new creature;" and that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." I spoke of making the fruit good, but I was not aware that the tree was corrupt, and must first be itself made good, before it could bear good fruit. The people however were satisfied with what they heard, and neither they nor I looked further. Almost the only remark made by any one on the discourse after leaving the church was, "what a good sermon we got to-day," to which another would coldly assent, adding "Many good advices do we get if we did but follow them." Such a heartless compliment was all the improvement made of the discourse, and I believe all the fruit of my preaching. The hearers readily gave me credit for a desire to do my duty, and they as readily took credit to themselves for a willingness to be taught their duty. But whether any improvement was actually going forward; whether there was any increase of the fruits of righteousness, was a point which gave neither minister nor people much concern. If there were any persons in the parish at that time, who lived a life of faith, under the influence of pure evangelical principles, I did not know them, nor was I qualified to discern or understand what spirit they were of. I have since had reason to believe that there were a very few spiritually minded persons; but their life was hid, and they had left this world, all but one or two, before they could acknowledge me as a brother. I was in a great measure ignorant of the peculiar doctrines of christianity—the corruption of the human will—the fulness and freeness of the redemption which is in Christ—justification by faith—and the necessity of the Holy Spirit's agency on the human soul. And what I knew not myself I could not declare to others. I never thought of praying for divine direction in my search after divine truth.* I believe I had read the confession of faith of our church before I had declared my belief of its contents; but I had taken little pains to compare it with the Scriptures. I certainly did not distinctly understand, nor

* May not many of us take home this to ourselves.

was I at all persuaded of the truth of many propositions contained in it. Yet I do not remember that I had any scruples about subscribing to it as the confession of my faith, or about declaring my assent to it solemnly in the presence of that congregation whereof I was about to take the pastoral charge. While I was yet ignorant of the truth, and unacquainted with christian experience, two persons under conviction of sin and terrors of conscience applied to me for advice. They supposed that one in the office of the ministry must of course be a man of God, and skilled in administering remedies for the diseases of the soul. They were widely mistaken in their judgment of me; for I had learned less of the practice than of the theory of pastoral duty. I said something to them in the way of advice, but it afforded them no relief. They were however under the care of the Good Physician. He applied his own balm to their wounded spirits, and "healed and bade them live." Being progressively and effectually taught of God, they are both now established judicious christians. These are the first that appear to have been converted since my incumbency, but they cannot be reckoned the fruits of my ministry. The Lord was now preparing to gather to himself a fuller harvest in this place. He might have removed me as a useless incumbrance, or rather an intervening obstacle out of the way, and subjected me to the doom of the unprofitable servant; but he was graciously pleased to spare me and visit me in mercy, and even to employ me as one of his instruments in carrying on his work. Glory to his name who commanded the light to shine out of darkness. The writings of pious men which were put in my hands by one or another christian friend, were made the means of bringing me acquainted with the truth of the gospel. Among these I may reckon the works of the Rev. John Newton and Thomas Scott, as eminently useful to me. I was slow in receiving and embracing the doctrines maintained by these writers. By degrees however, I was persuaded that they were agreeable to the scriptures, and that no doubt they must be admitted as true. I therefore durst not preach any thing which I conceived to be directly contrary to these doctrines, but I brought them forward rarely, incorrectly, and with awkward hesitation. The trumpet was sounded, but it gave an "uncertain sound." My preaching now consisted of a mixed kind of doctrine. I taught that human nature is corrupt and needs to be purified; that

righteousness cannot come by the Law; that we cannot be justified in the sight of God by our own works; that we can be justified only by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone. But in explaining the nature of saving faith, I conceived it as including many of its effects; a cordial acceptance of the plan of redemption by a Mediator, ardent gratitude to God our Saviour on account of that redemption, devotedness to his service, good will to our brethren of mankind, in a word, every pious and benevolent disposition of heart. I thought and taught, that on our possessing THIS faith, we should in consideration of it, have an interest in the redemption purchased by Christ, and consequently be accepted by God, and rewarded as righteous persons. Thus, by a short circuit, I arrived at the same point from which I had set out, still resting a sinner's acceptance with God on the conformity of his will to the divine law, and thus endeavoring to establish a human righteousness under the name of faith in Christ. It was plain indeed that this conformity of the will to the divine law, could be but imperfect in this life; yet imperfect as it was, it must, in my apprehension, be the ground of our justification and acceptance with God. Here I stumbled on that stumbling stone of sincere obedience, in substance at least, if not in so many words; imagining like many in whose writings I have since met with that opinion, that the great favor procured to men by Christ's sufferings and mediation, was a relaxation of the divine law; and that sincere and not perfect obedience was all that was now required. This was another gospel which could never be owned by God, as the gospel of his Son, nor accompanied by that sanctifying power which belongs exclusively to the truth. If it set any of my people on thinking, it only bewildered and misled them. They remained as before, unenlightened and unchanged. The biographical sketches in the Evangelical Magazine, were the principal means of impressing my heart, of opening my eyes to perceive the truth, of exciting a love to Godliness, and a desire after usefulness. The power of divine grace appeared illustrious in the composure, the joy, the triumph, with which many pious christians left the world. I saw their triumphant hope supported, not by a complacent reflection on a well spent life; but by a confidence in the unmerited love of Christ, and in his power and willingness to save even the chief of sinners. I was particularly struck with the account of ministers, who

had labored with much diligence and success, and had died at an early period of life, full of good fruits, while I, who have lived longer, and been longer in the ministry than they, could not say that I had taken any pains with my people, nor that I had been the means of reclaiming one sinner from the error of his way, or of saving one soul alive. The conversation and example of some persons of a truly spiritual mind, to whose acquaintance I was admitted, and who exhibited to my view what I found only described in written memoirs, conduced to impress on my mind the truth with which I was gradually becoming more acquainted. I cannot omit mentioning in this connection the blessing I enjoyed in the preaching, the prayers and the conversation of that much favored servant of Christ, the Rev. Charles Simeon, of King's College, Cambridge. He was a man sent from God to me; was my guest two days in June 1796, preached in my church, and left a savor of the things of God, which has remained ever since. From that time I began to teach and preach Jesus Christ with some degree of knowledge and confidence. From August 1797, to January 1798, I preached a course of sermons on the fundamental doctrines of christianity; the texts as follows: Matt. xvi. 26, "what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world and lose his soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—1 John iii. 4, "sin is the transgression of the law,"—Rom. iii. 23, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."—Gal. iii. 10, "cursed is every one, that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them,"—Rom. vi. 23, "the wages of sin is death."—Acts xvi. 30, "what shall I do to be saved?"—Mark i. 15, "repent ye and believe the gospel."—1 Tim. i. 15, "this is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief."—John vi. 37, "him that cometh unto me will I in no wise cast out."—Rom. v. 1, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."—1 Pet. ii. 7, "unto you that believe he is precious."—Heb. xii. 14, "follow holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord,"—Tit. ii. 13, "looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."—Luke xi. 13, "if ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them, that ask him?"—Heb. xii.

VOL. VIII.

27, "it is appointed for all men once to die and after that the judgment."—Heb. ii. 3, "how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? I was now enabled to show from scripture, that all men are by nature enemies to God, disobedient to his law, and on that account exposed to his just indignation and curse. I therefore addressed them, not as persons who were already, from education, birth-right or local situation possessed of saving faith, and other christian graces, but as sinners under sentence of death, who had not as yet obtained mercy. I did not as before merely reprove them for particular faults and vices, and urge them to the practice of particular virtues; but told them that the whole of their affections and inclinations, needed to be pointed in a new direction, and even their virtue to be new modelled. I showed that this, supposing it done, could not atone however for past offences, nor wipe away guilt already contracted; and that sin could not be remitted without satisfaction to the broken law of God; that neither could purity of heart and constant obedience in future recover their title to eternal life, which had been at first conferred as a free gift by God, and was now wholly forfeited by sin; yet that their case was by no means desperate; for we had the glad tidings to tell, that God had made provision for the complete salvation of sinners; that he had appointed his own eternal Son in the human nature to procure for sinners the pardon of sin, the renewing of their minds, and a title to glory by his own obedience and sufferings; that in conferring these blessings, God acts as a sovereign dispenser of his own gifts, not in consideration of any merit, (for there is none) in the persons on whom he bestows them; that a conformity of our will to the law of God, which I formerly considered as the ground of our acceptance, was itself a gift bestowed by God, in consequence of his having first justified, accepted and adopted us to be his children; that in this great salvation, wrought out by Christ for sinners, love to God and man, an abhorrence of evil and a disposition to what is good, were included as essential parts, inseparably connected with the rest, inso-much that if a man is not renewed in the spirit of his mind, neither are his sins pardoned nor his person accepted with God. I urged them to attend to what the word of God declared to be their condition; not to be deceived with vain hopes of recommending themselves to his favor by their own exertions; but as humble, needy supplicants to apply to him through the merits of Christ for

20

pardon, and the gift of his Spirit to make them serve him with fidelity and delight, to be diligent in studying the word of truth, which alone can make us wise unto salvation; and having obtained grace from God, to practice diligently every active and every self denying duty, and to abound in good fruit, to their own advancement in holiness and comfort, to the temporal and spiritual benefit of their fellow creatures, and to the praise of him who had called them out of darkness into his marvellous light. I thought it right often to caution them against judging of their state by transient impressions or emotions of which they might be conscious, but only by a prevailing habitual preference of God's honor and service to their own gratifications, appearing in the uniform tenor of their purposes and actions. The novelty of the matter, and some change in my manner of preaching excited attention, people began to think more, and sometimes to talk together of religious subjects, and of the sermons they heard; but I did not yet know of any deep and lasting impressions having been made. The two persons before mentioned as earliest converted, had by this time got clear views of the gospel, were enabled to derive comfort from the word of salvation and began to bear their testimony to the grace of God their Saviour. They were in use of visiting occasionally a poor infirm woman, who had long walked with God, and who now lived alone in a mean cottage in the neighboring village. It was proposed that they should come together to her house at an appointed time, and that I and some of my family should join them, and spend an evening hour or two in reading, conversation and prayer. In process of time different persons who were enquiring after the one thing needful, hearing how we were employed, and believing that God was with us, were, at their own request, admitted of our party. In this poor woman's smoky hovel, we continued to hold our weekly meetings to Aug. 1799, when she was called away to join the assembly of the first born above. Her growth in grace had been very conspicuous, and her death was triumphant. In the summer of 1798, the Lord's supper was dispensed in our congregation at the usual time of the year. For some weeks before, I endeavored in preaching, to explain more fully, and with more application to the conscience, the nature of the ordinance and the character of those, who, under the denomination of disciples were commanded to keep it. The exhortations and warnings then given, appeared to be accompanied with

a divine blessing. Some of the ordinary communicants, judging themselves to be in an unconverted state, kept back of their own accord, from partaking of the sacrament. Others, after conversing with me, privately took the same resolution. Many of those who might otherwise have applied for admission forbore to apply. I inferred this from the comparatively small number applying. For some years before, the number of candidates for admission each summer amounted to thirty, forty, and sometimes near fifty. In the summer of 1798, there were not above twelve, of whom nine were admitted. The sacrament was dispensed the same year again, in November, on which occasion there were only six more new communicants admitted. Although for the time the number of communicants was thus diminished, yet the number of those who were brought under concern about their eternal interests was increasing. This concern showed itself chiefly among the young under twenty-five or thirty. Their knowledge was yet imperfect, a natural shyness often hindered them long from discovering to others what they thought or felt; they had as yet no friend or intimate whom they judged able from experience to understand their situation or to give them counsel; some of them began to visit one of the two earlier converts formerly mentioned, from whose reading and conversation they derived considerable benefit. By means of this common friend, they were brought more acquainted with each other; one might now observe at church, after divine service, two or three small groups forming themselves around our few more advanced believers, and withdrawing from the crowd into the adjacent fields to exchange christian salutations and hold christian converse together. While a little cousin or other relative followed as a silent attendant on the party, and listened earnestly to their religious discourse. As the sacrament of the Lord's supper had been much abused, by admitting without strict examination or special instruction, all candidates who could give a tolerable answer to common questions, and who were free from grosser immoralities; so it must be confessed, that the sacrament of baptism had been still more profaned. Nothing but one kind of scandal was understood to preclude a man from admission to this ordinance; gross ignorance, or immoral behaviour, only laid a man open to some admonition or reproof, or at most laid him under the necessity of procuring another sponsor, but hardly ever hindered the baptism of his

child. Nothing subjects a man to greater disgrace or obloquy among us, than to have his child remain unbaptised. The dominion of custom in this matter is so despotic that most parents would chuse rather to carry their children a hundred miles, to be baptised by a popish priest, than to be refused baptism when they demand it. The superstitious notions, and other abuses attending our celebration of this sacrament, called loudly for reformation. Last year I preached a short course of sermons on baptism, at the same time, agreeably to a recent resolution and recommendation of the Presbytery to which I belong, I revived the laws of the church which had fallen into disuse, relative to this ordinance, particularly that which prohibits private baptism. Acts of Assembly 1690, X. Whenever I baptise a child on a week day, whether in the church or elsewhere, I give previous intimation of sermon, and after sermon, I administer the ordinance in the presence of the congregation; by these means many have been brought better to understand the nature of this sacrament, and to attend to it with more reverence. It had been long customary for the parent to give an entertainment according to his station, to his neighbors and connections, immediately after the baptism; by which means this sacred ordinance, instead of being regarded as a most solemn religious service, had degenerated into an occasion of carnal mirth and festivity. The more religiously disposed among us have set the example of discontinuing this practice. In Feb. 1799, it pleased God to call home my dear wife, after we had been married little more than five years. She too had been growing in grace during the last two years of her life. She labored for some months under a gradual decline, which impaired her strength, and occasioned sometimes a languor of spirits. But her faith and trust in her Redeemer were, on the whole, uniform and steady. Her dismissal from the body was gentle, and without pain or struggle. Her meek and humble behaviour, her growing love to her Saviour, and the joy she expressed at the prospect of being soon with him, were blessed to the edification of our pious neighbors, who often called to visit her. The following month, March 1799, I began a course of practical sermons on regeneration, which continued to the beginning of July following. These were attended with a more general awakening than had yet appeared among us. Seldom a week passed in which we did not see or hear of one, two or three persons brought under

deep concern about their souls, accompanied with strong convictions of sin, and an earnest inquiry after a Saviour. It was a great advantage to these, that there were others on the road before them; for they were seldom at a loss now to find acquaintance to whom they could freely communicate their anxious thoughts. The house of one of our most established christians became the chief resort of all who wished to spend an hour in reading or conversing about spiritual subjects. Some who had but newly begun to entertain serious thoughts about religion, and who had not yet come so far as to speak out their minds, would contrive an errand to this person's house, and listen to her talk. She was visited at other times by those who were drawn only by curiosity, or a disputatious spirit, who wanted to cavil at her words, or draw her into controversy.

Such visitors she did not avoid, and at last they ceased to avoid her. Other experienced christians among us have been extremely useful to their younger brethren and sisters. Their conversation and example have been a principal means of turning the attention of the young to religion, and of edifying those who have been already awakened. Such persons I find most serviceable auxiliaries. If they be neither prophets nor apostles, nor teachers, yet their usefulness in the church entitles them to the appellation of helps, 1 Cor. 12, 28, nor do I think an apostle would hesitate to acknowledge them, both men and women, in the relation of fellow laborers, Phil. 4, 3. Nor has success in this divine work been confined to instruments raised up among ourselves. The same happy effects have, in a certain measure, attended the preaching, the prayers or conversation of pious brethren, who have assisted at the celebration of the Lord's supper, or made us other occasional visits. It is observable that the work of conversion has been begun and carried on among this people in a quiet manner, without any confusion, and without those ungovernable agitations of mind, or convulsions of the body, or shrieking, or fainting, which have often accompanied a general awakening in other places. One young woman was so much moved in church, in March 1799, that she wept bitterly, and her friends thought it prudent to convey her out a little before the congregation was dismissed. She was for five or six days unfit for going about her usual work. In June following, at the time of our sacrament, she felt emotions of joy for a few days, to such a degree as to withdraw her regard in a great measure from

sensible objects. Spiritual affections were unusually strong in her, and spiritual objects appeared visible and near, but her sentiments were quite correct and scriptural. A few days afterward, when her emotions had subsided, she told me that she was at the time sensible that her mind was somewhat unsettled, but that she found comfort in recollecting the Apostle's words, "If we are beside ourselves it is to God." This was exactly her case. She continues a humble, lively christian, and except these two short intervals, she has regularly performed her ordinary work as a maid servant, to the satisfaction of her master and mistress, in whose service she still remains. Another woman, the mother of a family, in April last, was so much moved in hearing a sermon, that of her own accord, she left the church. Except these two instances, I know of none whose emotions under the preaching of the Lord discovered themselves in any other manner than by silent tears. Having lately made an enumeration of those of our congregation whom, to the best of my judgment, I trust I can reckon truly enlightened with the saving knowledge of Christ, I find their number about seventy. The greater part of these are under thirty years of age. Several are above forty, six or seven above fifty, one sixty-six, and one above seventy. Of children under twelve or fourteen there are a good many, who seem to have a liking to religion, but we find it difficult to form a decided opinion of their case. Of persons who have died within these twelve months, three we are persuaded, and we hope two or three others, have slept in Jesus. A very considerable number are friendly to religion, and countenance and defend the truth, even while they do not yet appear to live under its power. A few among ourselves did for a while jeer and deride the godly; but such persons are left in so very small a minority, that they have ceased to be troublesome. The scriptures too, are so generally read and referred to, that the truth itself serves to stop the mouth of scoffers. We are sometimes told that the sentiments and language of our people are much misrepresented, and are the object of much wonder and ridicule and invective in other places; but we only hear such things. They are hardly permitted to come nigh us. The chief opposition arises from those who possess superior scholarship, and acquaintance with the scriptures. These contend that there can be nothing substantial or necessary in that experimental knowledge which illiterate persons may pretend to

have attained; and that it is mere arrogance in them to imagine, that they can have a larger share of saving knowledge than men who are greater scholars and better versed in the scriptures. "Are we blind also?" has ever been the indignant language of carnal wisdom, of literary pride, and of self-righteous presumption. It is evident that the scriptures represent all mankind as divided into two classes. These are distinguished from each other in the most explicit manner, and the distinction is marked by the strongest language and the most significant comparison. They are called the children of God, and the children of the Devil. 1. John, 3, 10. The children of the kingdom, and the children of the wicked one. Matt. xiii. 38. The just, and the wicked, verse 49. They who are dead in trespasses and sins, and they who are quickened together with Christ. Eph. ii. 1-6. They are compared to wheat and tares. Matt. xiii. 25.; to good and bad fishes, ver. 47, 48; to sheep and goats, Matt. xxv, 32. In the general tenor of my preaching, especially in discussing the important doctrine of Regeneration, I have endeavored to keep in view this distinction, and to exhibit it clearly to the notice of my hearers. Many have been not a little offended at such a discrimination, and have found fault with the preacher—have complained of uncharitable judgment, pleading that it was God's prerogative to judge the heart—that they hoped theirs was good, though they did not make such a parading profession of religion, &c. The truth has prevailed however, and some have confessed to me that their first serious thoughts about the state of their souls arose from the surprise and resentment they felt on being classed under the character of unbelievers, along with murderers and idolaters. Rev. xxi. 8. But in giving such offensive though necessary warnings, I had much need of the spirit of Christ to repress all asperity of language and manner—to awaken tender compassion for those whom I addressed, and to make me speak the truth in love. I observe among our young converts a considerable variety of frames, but a striking uniformity of character. They are dejected or elevated according as their regard is more fixed on their own deficiencies and corruption, or on the glorious sufficiency of Christ. But all of them are characterized by lowliness of mind, by a warm attachment to each other, and to all who love the Lord Jesus, and by their affections set on things above. I know no instances among them of persons trusting for comfort

or direction to dreams or visions, or impulses, or impressions, and hardly an instance of seeking comfort from external signs or tokens, arbitrarily assumed by the enquirer, after the example of Abraham's servant. Gen. xxiv. 14.; and of Gideon. Judg. vi. 36, 40. We have not yet to lament any great falling off in those who appeared to have once undergone a saving change. There may be persons who for a time were enquiring with some apparent earnestness, and afterwards fell back to their former unconcern. I have reason to suspect that there may be several in this situation, though I have not access to know the exact state of their minds. May the Lord discover it to themselves in time. But all, so far as I know, who seemed to have been once truly humbled for their sins, and made to feel in their hearts the grace of God in the gospel, continue thus far to maintain a humble, spiritual, conscientious walk. They have a constant appetite for the sincere milk of the word, and christian fellowship with one another. The younger sort have lost their former levity of speech and behaviour, and are become devout and sober minded. Those more advanced in life, have laid aside their selfishness and worldly mindedness, and are grown humble, contented and thankful. The external effects of a general concern about religion, have appeared in the behaviour, even of those who do not seem to have experienced a change of heart. While the young people attended a Sabbath school, those who were grown up used to spend the evening of that day in sauntering about the fields and woods, in gossiping parties, or visiting their acquaintance at a distance, without improving their time by any profitable exercise. Now there is hardly a lounge to be seen, nor any person walking abroad, except going to some house or meeting, where he may hear the scriptures read. Swearing, profane talking, foolish and indecent jesting, have in a great measure ceased. At late wakes, where people assemble to watch by the body of a deceased neighbor, the whole night used to be spent in childish noisy sports and pastimes. Even the apartment where the corpse lay, was the scene of their revelry. This unnatural custom, which is still pretty general over a great part of the Highlands, is almost wholly discontinued in this part of the country. They still assemble on such occasions, but they pass the time in reading the bible or some religious book, and in sober conversation. In reply to your request of relating a few of the most remarkable cases of conversion

which have occurred among this people, I must say that I have little uncommon to relate. I have mentioned already, that almost all our converts have been brought to serious concern and inquiry in a quiet gradual manner. To an intelligent observer, the change in the conversation, temper, deportment, and the very countenance of individuals, is striking. The change too on the general aspect of the manners of the people is conspicuous. The effect is thus on the whole obvious. Yet there are few particulars in the case of each person, which taken singly, will appear uncommon, or worthy of being detailed in a separate narrative. We have no instances of persons remarkable for profligacy of manners, or profaneness of speech, who have been reclaimed from such enormities, because there was none of that description to be found in our society. The change has been from ignorance and indifference, and disrelish to divine things, to knowledge, and concern, and spiritual enjoyment. Neither are there amongst us examples of persons suddenly struck and impressed by some alarming event, or singular interposition of Providence. The word of truth proclaimed in public, or spoken in private, has been almost the only outward means of producing conviction of sin, and confidence in the Saviour. In every single case, the power of God is visible in the effect produced, but there is little "diversity of operation." Instead of endeavoring to paint the beauties of holiness in the scene around me, I rather wish to prevail with you and other friends, who know how to enjoy such a spectacle, to come and see.

I have thus, my dear sir, endeavored to give a concise view of the prosperous state of religion in this congregation for the last two or three years, &c.

(From the Presbyterian.)

FENCING IN HERESY.

A piece has appeared in the Vermont Chronicle of July 29th, which may or may not be editorial, just as it may suit, or we may *fancy to guess*. At any rate it seems to be a fatherless child.

This little phillippic is captioned, "Fencing out Heresy." The author, whoever he may be, seems to take it highly amiss that I should presume to attribute superior efficacy to the Presbyterian form of Church government, above the Congregational, in guarding against the introduction of error into the church.

I choose to premise what I have to observe on the subject, by saying, that it gives me great pleasure to avow the belief, that the congregational churches of New-England embosom an immense amount of piety, and noble christian effort. As such, I hail them in our common Lord. But this shall not blind me to what I deem certain blemishes, or deficiencies in the government of their churches.

Not that we would presume to call in question the veracity of the writer in the Chronicle; but we should like to see the *proof* of all that which he has so learnedly produced in defence of the beneficial and uniform course of the congregational churches in Europe, and the corresponding defection and tendency to decline, especially to fall into Socinianism, observable in the Presbyterian churches. And much should we like to see a full drawn portrait by a hand which no doubt could sketch it well, of the exerted energy of the congregational churches in New-England, in their judicial capacity, (if indeed they have any such capacity,) "to stem the torrent of Socinianism in America. But perhaps they have found out that the best way to prevent the spread of error, is to *fence it in*—that the best way to cure a wound is to skin it over—that the best way to preserve peace in the church, is to have no judicial courts, no creeds, no written form of church government—but let every man believe and do that which is right in his own eyes.

I have not time to notice all the instances the writer has brought, of the degeneracy of Presbyterianism in Europe. I shall select only one as a sample of all the others. The writer in the Chronicle says, "In Ireland, a large number of Presbyterian ministers and churches have become Arian, and have seceded from the main body, and set up a separate organization. The Congregational churches have no such trouble."

The following are the facts upon this subject.

Many years since, the Synod of Ulster in Ireland, permitted each Presbytery within its limits to use their pleasure, as to whether their candidates for licensure and ordination should adopt the Confession of Faith, or not. Some of the Presbyteries, following this liberal example, afterwards left it to the young gentlemen themselves to declare their belief in these standards or refuse to do so, as seemed good in their sight. The consequence was, that after the lapse of a few years, Arminianism began to be avowed by some of the ministers, and afterwards

Arianism showed its front; and when the orthodox party took the alarm, and examined into the matter, in 1828 and 1829, it was found that about thirty of the ministers declared themselves Anti-Trinitarians, and anti creed men; and they were handled so roughly that at length they withdrew, and formed a distinct and separate body. Let these facts speak for themselves. This Synod of Ulster had by a most absurd act, transformed themselves into the Congregational order, though they still retained the name. That is, they had laid aside as useless, the Presbyterian creed, and renounced the very most essential part of Presbyterian government. Will the writer in the Chronicle tell us, in what the Congregationalists of New-England differ, in their mode of bringing young men into the ministry, from the Synod of Ulster?

But supposing all that is stated in the Chronicle to be true; I would lay this down as a principle, which American experience, and, could the matter be traced out, European experience too, will prove to be a correct position, viz. that however pious and good Congregationalists may be as individual members of the church; yet whenever such a form of church government prevails, the church does in her associated capacity, form a *convenient nucleus*, around which errors of every kind may accumulate. Is the writer of the Chronicle prepared to say, whether the Presbyterian churches in Europe, who fell off to Socinianism, were not drawn off to it precisely in that way, in which many Presbyterian churches in America, are in danger of dropping into the same gulph?

It pains me to say it, but who does not know that the present distracted condition of the Presbyterian churches in the United States may be traced mainly to two causes. 1st, our intimate connection with the Congregational churches, till we have become restive under our own stricter form of church government, and begin to wish for the liberty of having, or not having, creeds and subscriptions, just as we please. And 2d, to the introduction of *notions* from New-England, among us; compounded three-fourths of metaphysics, and the other fourth of New School Divinity, without one grain of simple bible truth in the composition. Do not mistake me; I am far from saying that there is no bible truth or bible piety in New-England. Glory to God, he has reserved to himself "seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to Baal." But these good men are not disturbers of the peace of their

southern and western neighbors. Let me ask the writer in the Chronicle, where are Doctors Murdock and Taylor? Have they, with all their errors about them, been disowned by the New-England churches? No, they repose snugly in the bosom of the church, and are poisoning the south and west with their unscriptural speculations. This is what I call *fencing in error*. Can we take coals in our bosom and not be burned? Who does not know that a few grains of leaven, if permitted to remain, will leaven the whole lump?

Should some Presbyterian churches, under the operation of the causes we have mentioned, fall off, (which may God forbid,) to Arianism, or Socinianism, no doubt some Chronicle of Vermont, fifty or an hundred years hence, will repeat the story of the present Chronicle, with the addition of the American example. But we beg leave to enter our protest, and let it be known, that if there be Socinianism in the Presbyterian Church, it is an *exotic*, translated from the birth-place of *new discoveries* in theology, and ingrafted upon the Presbyterian stock, by the hands of *committee-men—Home-missary men—anti-Creed men*, and pseudo-Congregationalists.

JAMES BLYTHE.

BLACKSTONE ON DUELLING.

Express malice is when one, with a sedate, deliberate mind and formed design, doth kill another; which formed design is evidenced by external circumstances, discovering that inward intention; as laying in wait, antecedent menaces, former grudges, and concerted schemes to do him bodily harm. This takes in the case of deliberate duelling, when both parties meet with an intent to murder, thinking it their duty as gentlemen, and claiming it as their right, to wanton with their own lives and those of their fellow creatures, without any warrant or authority from any power either divine or human, but in direct contradiction to the laws both of God and man: and therefore the law has justly fixed the crime and punishment of murder on them, and on their seconds also.

BLACKSTONE ON SUICIDE.

Self-murder, the pretended heroism, but real cowardice of the Stoic philosophers, who destroyed themselves to avoid those ills which they had not fortitude to endure, was punished by the Athenian law with cutting off the hand which committed the des-

perate deed, (Pott. Antiq. b. i. c. 26.) And also the law of England wisely and religiously considers, that no man hath a power to destroy life, but by commission from God, the author of it: and as the suicide is guilty of a double offence; one spiritual, invading the prerogative of the Almighty, and rushing into his immediate presence uncalled for; the other temporal, against the king, who hath an interest in the preservation of all his subjects; the law has therefore ranked this among the highest crimes, making it a peculiar species of felony, a felony on one's self. And this admits of accessories before the fact, as well as other felonies; for if one persuades another to kill himself, and he does so, the adviser is guilty of murder. A *felo de se* therefore is he that deliberately puts an end to his own existence, or commits any unlawful, malicious act, the consequence of which is his own death: as if attempting to kill another, he runs upon his antagonist's sword: or shooting at another, the gun bursts and kills himself. The party must be of years of discretion, and in his senses, else there is no crime. But this excuse ought not to be strained to that length, to which our coroners' juries are apt to carry it, viz. that the very act of suicide is an evidence of insanity; as if every man who acts contrary to reason, had no reason at all; for the same argument would prove every other criminal *non compos*, as well as the self-murderer.

With some people, earnestness is anger; plain bible truth speaking, lack of dignity; to say as you mean, rudeness; zeal in a righteous and urgent cause, fanaticism; an unequivocal disapprobation of vice and crime, uncharitable inhumanity; an unwavering adherence to principle, imbecility or stubbornness; candid acknowledgment of error, meanness; chaste politeness, libertine insult; disinterestedness, downright folly; *unostentatious* benevolence, a whim; pure friendship, an incomprehensible affectation; piety, bigotry; outward show, religion; love of money, virtuous sensibility; money, the one thing needful; wealth, immortality.

(From the New-York Observer.)

A VISIT TO THE POPE'S PRIVATE CHAPEL.

The Hon. D. D. Barnard in this state, in one of a series of letters inserted in the Rochester Daily Advertiser, thus describes his visit to the private Chapel of the Pope at Rome, in March last. The ceremonies which Mr. B. witnessed will strongly remind the reader of some of the descriptions in the Revelation.

I went the other day to look at the strange things

to be enacted in the Pope's private chapel on the Quirinal Hill. On approaching the Palace, the first objects that attracted my attention were a multitude of plain red coaches with servants in shabby livery, flying about in every direction, going out and coming in, and principally engaged in gathering up, and bringing in poor priests and prelates, in preparation for the approaching ceremonies. The pope has forty of these red-coaches in his service. His own equipage, however, is magnificent beyond description, and it always requires six horses to draw his Holiness. At the portal of the Palace I found a small body of Swiss guard, some with spears, and dressed in tri-coloured ancient costume, with slashed doublets and hose, and a quadruple ruff around the neck. Another body of these men were formed in open column from the outer door of the chapel, through a large anti-apartment to the chancel. Through the ranks of these guards, the Cardinals, about forty in number, marched into their respective places in the chapel. They came in one by one, with great pomp and ceremony—each being preceded by a priest, who bore his red cap, and followed by another who bore the train of his robes. On arriving at the front of the altar, it was necessary of course, that he should kneel for an instant: which, however, did not cost him much trouble, as he was assisted by his attendants, both in getting down and getting up. When seated, a priest sat at his feet to hold his hat and a little toy crown, and to adjust his robes for the various movements and positions required in the exercise for the morning. Several personages of the Pope's personal and political household made their appearance in black court dresses, and wearing steel swords. When every thing was ready, the Pope entered from the Palace by a private door. Before him marched one of the household bearing the golden tiara, for he wore the mitre. He was followed closely, by two cardinals, who bore the train of his robes, and he was attended on entering by many priests, prelates and others, all having their appropriate office—among them were the mace-bearers, and an officer bearing the dignified appellation of *the Roman Senator*. At the moment of his entering, twelve officers in uniform, all young noblemen, with drawn swords, formed a semi-circle around the door way of the chancel. On passing the altar, the Pope stopped to kneel; one attendant taking off and putting on his mitre, others adjusting his robes, and others assisting to ease him down and raise him up. When the Pope was seated on his throne, which is erected on the side of the chapel near the altar, the cardinals began a procession and presenting themselves before him in succession had the honor of kissing his hand, which his holiness graciously extended to each in turn, covered however with the golden hem of his garment. After this ceremony, the religious exercises are commenced.—The officiating priests always kneel before the Pope at the commencement and close of every separate service. When the Pope would condescend to look into a book, it was held before him by a cannon kneeling. Whenever any of the numerous retinue on service had occasion to pass before the Pope, as happened almost every instant, it was never done without kneeling. Three separate times incense was offered before the throne, and to him that sat upon it. A cannon who was entitled to this inestimable privilege on account of the peculiar part which he bore in the ceremonies, prostrated himself, *tandem*, before the Vicegerent, and devoutly kissed his red slipper—which was as near the holy toe as he could

come. The same thing was done by the Monk who had the honor to preach before him, immediately before mounting his pulpit. After the sermon, a priest kneeled before the Pope and prayed, at the close of which the latter rose and graciously bestowed his blessing on the kneeling multitude around him, simply by stretching out his right hand and shaking the benedictions off from the ends of his fingers. High mass was celebrated, and at the end the Pope embraced three cardinals with a *Pax tecum*, and through them, by the same form, it was transmitted to the rest of the cardinals. The Pope then left the throne and the chapel with the same circumstance with which he had entered, and immediately made his appearance at a balcony of the Palace which looks out on the great square of Monte Cavallo. Ten thousand persons assembled in this square, including soldiers, and the whole mass dropt instantaneously on their knees, as his holiness presented himself at the window. In this position they received his benediction, shaken off in the same manner as before, from the ends of his holy fingers—about which, blinded I suppose by heresy, I could discover nothing remarkable, except the flashes of light which shot out from a brilliant diamond which he sported on his hand.

Of the scene in the chapel, I hardly dare suffer myself to speak beyond the faithful, though brief account I have already given you. I cannot avoid saying, however, that the worship was most evidently offered vastly more to the Pope than to the Deity; and that the attempt at display and pomp falling infinitely short of what is witnessed in well regulated theatres every day, was not enough to save the whole scene from being to me, both contemptible and disgusting.

I ought also, while on this subject, to add, that Catholicism in this country, is a vastly different thing from what it is in America. So far as I have observed it there, it seems to have been purified crossing the Atlantic—at least it has been by coming in contact with our institutions. Certain it is, that it exists among us, relieved of many of the absurdities and superstitions which belong to it at Rome.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

At a *pro re nata* meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Muskingum, held at Cadiz, on the 24th of August last, Mr. James C. Bruce was, according to order of Synod, ordained to the office of the holy ministry, with a view to the fulfilling of his appointment on the Western Mission. Sermon by Rev. John Walker, from Ezek. iii. 17. The charge by Rev. Thomas Hanna.

The Associate Presbytery of Alleghany, met at Upper Piney on the 9th of August last; when the Rev. James McCarrell was installed as the pastor of that congregation and the adjoining branches. Public worship was introduced with praise and prayer by Rev. Mr. Kirkland. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Dicky from Rom. x. 15. The charges to pastor and people by Rev. Mr. Blair. (The charges will be published in the next No. of the Monitor.)

At the same meeting, Mr. John Hindman accepted a call from the congregations of Mahoning, Berachah and Concord.

onk-
me-
the
and
ing
out
off
cel-
ree
em,
rest
one
with
his
oks
fen
clu-
ata-
ted
re-
me
fin-
esy,
the
dia-

ffer
rief
void
evi-
the
omp
l in
ugh
both

that
rent
as I
pu-
n by
tain
y of
g to

Pres-
24th
ord-
e of
g of
Ser-
17.

et at
when
the
ning
with
Ser-
The
clair.
No.

ac-
laho-

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as agents:

Wm. Stevenson, Jun., Cambridge, Washington Co. N. Y.

James M'Lolland, New-York City.

George M'Queen, Esq. Schenectady.

A. Bachop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.

Wm. Dickey, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Wm. M. Goodwillie, Barnet, Vt.

Rev. A. Whyte, Jr., Baltimore, Md.

Andrew Munro, Canonsburgh, Pa.

John M'Cleary, York, Livingston Co. N. Y.

Philip Watts, Shelbyville, Ky.

James Galloway, Jr., Xenia, Ohio.

Subscribers in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, are requested to make payment to the Synod's Missionaries, who will also receive and forward the names of new subscribers.

Agents or others may enclose money to us at our risk, and at our expense where more than \$5 is enclosed.

A number of extra copies of volume eight are being printed under the expectation that they will be called for.

TERMS \$2 00 per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

* * All letters relating to the Monitor, whether they contain communications for our pages, or names of subscribers, or remittances of money, should be addressed to B. D. PACKARD & Co. or to CHAUNCEY WEBSTER, 71 State-street, Albany.

JUST PUBLISHED,

PREDESTINATION Calmly Considered from Principles of Reason, in consistency with the nature of things, and the Scriptures of Truth, in a series of letters to a friend. Also, **Answers to Seven Queries on Predestination**, by W. C. Tucker.

To which is appended the article on **Divine Sovereignty**, in volume 2, of the use of Sacred History, by James Jamieson, D. D. 252 pages large 18mo. Price 50 cts.

Copies of this invaluable book have been forwarded for sale to Andrew Munro, Canonsburgh, Pa.; Rev. J. Beveridge, Philadelphia; Mr. John Duncan, 407 Broadway, New-York; Mr. Wm. Stevenson, Cambridge, N. Y.; Rev. Peter Campbell, Florida, N. Y.; Rev. J. G. Smart, Johnstown, N. Y.; and the Rev. John Russell, Queenston, Upper Canada. Should any of the ministers of the Associate Church in the Western and Southern States desire copies of this book for circulation in their neighborhood, they will be sent to them on commission.

TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.

The undersigned, having been requested to express their sentiments respecting the two treatises contained in this little volume, take pleasure in recommending them to all those who desire to *know* and *walk* in the truth, on the important subjects, of which they treat. Although there are other excellent treatises on these subjects which are occasionally to be found in the market; yet the present prevailing indifference to divine truth, especially on these all important points, the consequent abounding of Pelagian and Arminian errors in our country, seem to demand some defence of the Scripture views of these doctrines, at this time. In these two treatises, which are well calculated to accompany each other, the subjects discussed, viz. Predestination and Divine Sovereignty are set forth in a plain, able, and Scriptural manner. They have been both generally and justly esteemed by the friends of truth on the other side the Atlantic, and we can cordially recommend them to the christian public in our own country as eminently seasonable at the present time. They are here presented in a very cheap and convenient form and well adapted to a general circulation.

ALEXANDER BULLIONS, D. D.,

Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Cambridge, N. Y.

JAMES P. MILLER,

Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Argyle, N. Y.

JAMES MARTIN,

Pastor of the Associate Congregation of Albany, N. Y.

Cambridge, July 25th, 1831.

For sale by B. D. PACKARD & Co., No. 71 State-street.